

LUND STUDIES IN AFRICAN AND ASIAN RELIGIONS

VOL. 3

A TREATISE
ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY
OF GOD
BY ISRAEL OF KASHKAR (d. 872)

Introduction, edition and word index

Bo Holmberg



LUND · PLUS ULTRA · 1989

A TREATISE
ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY
OF GOD
BY ISRAEL OF KASHKAR (d. 872)

Introduction, edition and word index

av
Bo Holmberg
FK TK, Östgöta nation

AKADEMISK AVHANDLING
som för avläggande av filosofie doktorsexamen
vid humanistiska fakulteten vid universitetet i Lund
kommer att offentligen försvaras å sal LU 213
lördagen den 18 mars 1989, kl. 10

Organization LUND UNIVERSITY Institute of Middle East Languages Box 752 S-220 07 Lund	Document name DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
	Date of issue February 1989
	CODEN: LUHSDF/(HSSS-1005)/1-290/(1989)
Author(s) Bo Holmberg	Sponsoring organization
Title and subtitle A Treatise on the Unity and Trinity of God by Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). Introduction, edition and word index.	
Abstract The present work is a contribution to the study of Christian Arabic literature. An apologetic treatise on the Unity and Trinity of God incorrectly attributed to Yahya ibn ^cAdi (d. 974) is edited for the very first time and provided with a comprehensive word index. The edition is based on six manuscripts found in Egypt. Four of these manuscripts have so far not been known to scholarly research. The introduction to the edition falls into two chapters. The first chapter focuses on the question of authorship. As a first step, the treatise is compared with the authentic works of <u>Yahya ibn ^cAdi</u>, and the pros and cons of an attribution to him are investigated. The points of references are doctrinal, lexicographic, and stylistic. Only by means of an hypothesis implying that the treatise is a very early work by Yahya can the traditional attribution be accepted. As a second step, the implications of a marginal note in the oldest manuscript are put to the test. According to this note, a certain al-Kaskari is the author of the treatise. In search for Christian Arabic authors related to Kashkar in Iraq, the two bishops of Kashkar both called Israel (d. 872 and 962) appear to be the most likely candidates for the authorship of the treatise. By relating the treatise to what we know of these two bishops and to what they have written, it becomes clear that the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is the author. The conclusion is based on both external and internal arguments. Close parallels with regard to doctrine (Unity and Trinity), style and method of reasoning (the argument <u>a minore ad maiorem</u>), and terminology (<u>rasil</u>) are shown to exist between the treatise and Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). The second chapter contains a description of the manuscripts, the principles of edition and an outline of the treatise.	
Key words Christian Arabic literature, apologetics, authorship, Unity, Trinity, Yahya ibn ^c Adi (d. 974), Israel of Kashkar/al-Kaskari (d. 872), Kashkar.	
Classification system and/or index terms (if any)	
Supplementary bibliographical information	Language English
ISSN and key title ISSN 0284 - 8651	ISBN 99-86668-28-5
Recipient's notes	Number of pages 288 pp. + 6 plates
	Price Security classification

Distribution by (name and address)

I, the undersigned, being the copyright owner of the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation, hereby grant to all reference sources permission to publish and disseminate the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation.

Signature

Bo Holmberg

Date

Lund, February 3, 1989

A TREATISE
ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY
OF GOD
BY ISRAEL OF KASHKAR (d. 872)

Pia
David Maria
Teresa Josef Simon

Contents

Preface	11
Introduction	14
Chapter One: The Question of authorship	
1 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī	17
1.1 Life and work	17
1.1.1 Life	17
1.1.2 Works	18
1.1.3 Impact	20
1.2 Arguments for an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī	21
1.2.1 The image of a ship on a river	22
1.2.2 The three levels of existence	23
1.2.3 Approximation and the formula على التقريب والتمثيل	24
1.3 Arguments against an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī	25
1.3.1 Philosophical terms and stylistic expressions	26
1.3.1.1 عين	26
1.3.1.2 ماهية	27
1.3.1.3 من البين	28
1.3.2 Doctrinal differences	28
1.3.2.1 The triads of divine attributes	28
1.3.2.2 The doctrine of divine Unity	29
1.3.2.3 The dialectics of propositions and terms	31
1.4 An attempt to defend an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī by means of an hypothesis	33
1.4.1 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and an-Nāshī' al-Akbar	33
1.4.2 Philosophical terms and stylistic expressions	35
1.4.2.1 عين	35
1.4.2.2 ماهية	36
1.4.2.3 من البين	36
1.4.3 Doctrinal differences	37
1.4.3.1 The triads of divine attributes	37
1.4.3.2 The doctrine of divine Unity	38
1.4.3.3 The dialectics of propositions and terms	40
1.5 Summary	40
2 al-Kaskarī	42
2.1 The Nestorian diocese of Kashkar and the possible candidates for the authorship of <i>Risāla fī tathbīt</i>	42

2.1.1 The Nestorian diocese of Kashkar	
2.1.2 Possible candidates for the authorship of the treatise	42
2.1.2.1 Bābai of Kashkar (d. 853)	43
2.1.2.2 Michael, bishop of al-Ahwāz (d. 853)	43
2.1.2.3 Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	43
2.1.2.4 Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	43
2.1.2.5 Elia of Kashkar (d. 986 or 987)	44
2.1.2.6 Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī (10th cent.)	44
2.1.2.7 Abū l-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā (10th cent.)	45
2.1.2.8 Summary	46
	48
2.2 Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	
2.2.1 The testimony of <i>Kitāb al-majdal</i>	48
2.2.2 The dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhṣī (MS Florence, <i>Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana</i> , Ar. 299, foll. 149v-156r)	48
2.2.2.1 Two questions raised by the title of the dialogue	50
2.2.2.2 A summary of the dialogue and its information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	50
2.2.2.3 The question of historicity and literary genre	51
	57
2.3 Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	58
2.4 Works attributed to "Israel, bishop of Kashkar" or an anonymous bishop of Kashkar	61
2.4.1 The discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā	61
2.4.2 <i>Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna</i>	66
2.4.3 A refutation of the Jews (MS Cairo, <i>Copt. Patr. Hist.</i> 61)	67
2.4.4 The extracts on the abrogation of the Mosaic law in Chapter 6 of <i>Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn</i> by Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl	75
2.4.5 A Syriac liturgy of the pre-sanctified (MS Cambridge, <i>Univ. Libr., Add.</i> 1988)	78
2.4.6 MS Paris, <i>Bibl. nat.</i> , arab. 309, foll. 129r-156v	79
2.4.7 Summary	80
2.5 Arguments for and against an attribution of the treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	81
2.5.1 External arguments for Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	81
2.5.1.1 The <i>nisba</i> of al-Kashkarī	81
2.5.1.2 The reputation of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) as a speculative thinker and controversialist	82

2.5.2 Internal arguments for Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	82
2.5.2.1 The doctrine of divine Unity	82
2.5.2.2 The Trinitarian doctrine	84
2.5.2.2.1 The triad of divine attributes	85
2.5.2.2.2 The question of separations between the divine hypostases	85
2.5.2.2.3 The Trinitarian analogies	87
2.5.2.3 Style and method of reasoning	88
2.5.2.4 Terminology: the case of رسیل	89
2.5.3 Arguments against Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)	90
2.5.3.1 Israel's alleged ignorance of Arabic	90
2.5.3.2 The authorship and the historicity of the report on the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī	92
2.5.3.3 A chronological argument	96
2.5.4 Summary	99
2.6 Arguments for and against an attribution of the treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	100
2.6.1 A possible argument for Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	100
2.6.2 Arguments against Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	101
2.6.2.1 The absence of the <i>nisba</i> of al-Kaskarī	101
2.6.2.2 The non-philosophical character of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)	102
2.6.2.3 Stylistic differences	102
2.6.2.4 A doctrinal discrepancy: the triads of divine attributes	103
3 Summary of the question of the authorship of the treatise	104
Chapter Two: A description of the manuscripts, the principles of edition, and the outline of the treatise	107
1 A description of the manuscripts	107
1.1 MS A (= ا)	107
1.1.1 General features	107
1.1.2 Date, copyist, descendance	108
1.2 MS B (= ب)	110
1.2.1 General features	110
1.2.2 Date, copyist, descendance	110
1.3 MS C (= ج)	113
1.3.1 General features	113
1.3.2 Date, copyist, descendance	113
1.4 MS D (= د)	114
1.4.1 General features	114
1.4.2 Date, copyist, descendance	114
1.5 MS E (= هـ)	116

1.5.1 General features	116
1.5.2 Date, copyist, descendance	116
1.6 MS F (= و)	117
1.6.1 General features	117
1.6.2 Date, copyist, descendance	118
1.7 The stemma of the manuscripts	119
1.8 Script and orthography of the manuscripts	120
1.8.1 Script	120
1.8.2 Orthography and phonetics	120
1.8.2.1 The consonants	120
1.8.2.1.1 Hamza	120
1.8.2.1.2 ذ and ث	121
1.8.2.1.3 Tā' marbūṭa	121
1.8.2.2 The vowels	121
1.8.2.2.1 Scriptio defectiva	122
1.8.2.2.2 Scriptio plena	123
1.8.2.2.3 Alif maqṣūra and alif mamdūda	123
1.8.2.2.4 حياة instead of حيوة	123
1.8.2.3 Other orthographic signs	124
1.8.2.3.1 Shadda, madda and sukūn	124
1.8.2.3.2 The distinction of unpointed consonants from their pointed counterparts	124
1.8.2.3.3 Alif al-wiqāya	125
1.8.2.4 Miscellaneous	125
2 The principles of edition	125
3 The outline of the treatise	129
Bibliography	139
General index	155
Index of important Arabic words	165
Index of Greek words	168
Plates	

Arabic section

Edition	٢-٧٢
Word index	٧٢-١٢٠

Preface

In the present study a Christian Arabic treatise traditionally attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī (d. 974) is edited and translated for the very first time.

Although Georg Graf¹ knew of the two manuscripts in the library of the Coptic-Orthodox Patriarchate in Cairo containing the treatise (MS B dating from 1783 and MS D dating from 1875), his description of their contents was impaired by serious mistakes. The treatise which I have edited, for instance, Graf² erroneously identified with a treatise on the Incarnation to be found in several manuscripts and edited in 1920 by Augustin Périer.³

The first scholar who presented an adequate description of the two Cairene manuscripts was Emilio Platti⁴ in 1974. He gave a list of the titles and some minor comments on all the 33 treatises contained in this collection of treatises attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī. The two manuscripts are identical. The entire volume is entitled *Kitāb al-burhān fī d-dīn*, though this in fact is only the title of the first treatise in the collection. As for the treatise *Risāla fī tathbīt* with which we are concerned here and which appears as no. 11 in the collection, Platti⁵ was the first scholar to draw attention to the marginal note in MS B which puts the attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī in doubt by attributing it to a certain as-Sukkarī.

The next reference to the treatise is found in Gerhard Endress⁶ inventory of the works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī which appeared in 1977. Endress also refers to the marginal note in MS B, but goes further than Platti by cautiously proposing that as-Sukkarī be read as-Sijazī (i.e. Abū Sulaymān as-Sijistānī).

In my paper⁷ presented at the Second International Conference on Christian Arabic Studies in 1984, I argued against an attribution of the treatise to the Muslim philosopher Abū Sulaymān as-Sijistānī, and since then I have even discovered that the "as-Sukkarī" of MS B is nothing but a scribal alteration - accidental or deliberate - on the part of the copyist of this manuscript.⁸ Thus the speculation on as-Sijistānī is rendered quite superfluous. Instead of as-Sukkarī we are obliged to read al-Kaskarī according to MS A, and this fact puts the whole question of the authenticity of the treatise in a new light. Consequently, in the first chapter of my study I

¹ Graf, *Catalogue*, 232-234, and Graf, *GCAL* 2, 233-249.

² Graf, *GCAL* 2, 243 (no. 10).

³ Périer, *Petits traités*, 87-109. The treatise in question is Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's *Jawāb 'an mas'ala*.

⁴ Platti, *Deux manuscrits*.

⁵ Platti, *Deux manuscrits*, 222 (no. 11).

⁶ Endress, *Works*, 106 (no. 8.19.3).

⁷ Holmberg, *Notes on a treatise*, 236-237.

⁸ Cf. Holmberg, *al-Kaskarī and as-Sukkarī*, 219-220.

try to elucidate the question of authorship by seriously considering the pros and cons of an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī as well as the implications of "al-Kaskarī" in the marginal note. As the title of the present book already reveals, I end up attributing the treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872).

Both Emilio Platti and Gerhard Endress were only aware of the existence of the two Cairene MSS BD. In addition to these, I have discovered four other manuscripts hitherto unknown to scholarly research. Two of these belong to the library of the Monastery of St. Antony by the Red Sea - MS A dating from 1570 and MS C dating from 1788 - and a third manuscript belongs to the Monastery of St. Bishoi in Wādī Naṭrūn - MS E dating from 1882. The fourth manuscript - MS F - only contains the latter part of the treatise (i.e. §§ 119-221). It was probably written early in the 20th century and belongs to the Franciscan Centre of Christian Oriental Studies in Cairo. Among these manuscripts, the 16th century MS A is of great importance, being the MS on which all the other manuscripts ultimately depend. MS A therefore is the basic MS of my edition. In the second chapter of my study, the manuscripts will be described, a stemma will be established, and the principles of edition will be presented. In addition to this the outline of the treatise will be given. For reasons of space, I have decided to publish the English translation of the treatise and the commentary in a separate volume.

The most important part of this book remains the Arabic section, where the treatise in question is edited for the very first time and furnished with a comprehensive word index.

I here take the opportunity to express my gratitude to His Holiness Patriarch Shenouda III who granted me permission to photograph the manuscripts in the Library of the Coptic-Orthodox Patriarchate in Cairo and in the monasteries of Egypt. Without this kind permission the present work could not have been written.

I also wish to thank Professor Gösta Vitestam who has been my supervisor during the preparation of this book. He has always encouraged me in my work.

My colleagues in the research seminar at the Department of Middle East Languages at Lund University have given me important suggestions for improvements. I am very grateful to all of them. A special thank I owe Samuel Rubenson with whom I have had many fruitful discussions on Christian Arabic studies.

Mrs. Muriel Spalding-Larsson has helped me correct my English. I am very grateful to her.

I also thank Professor Tord Olsson for accepting my work as Volume 3 in the series *Lund Studies in African and Asian Religions* of which he is the editor.

Most of all I wish to thank my wife Pia. Without her never-ending

patience and support this work would not have been brought to completion.
To her and our children I dedicate this book.

Bo Holmberg
Flöjtvägen 10 A
S-223 68 Lund
Sweden

SVENSKA FÖRENINGENS INSTITUTET
ISTANBUL

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One: The Question of Authorship

Though the treatise in question is formally attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and has been transmitted together with authentic works by Yaḥyā, a cursory comparison of this treatise with the authentic works inevitably raises the question of authorship. In addition to this, a marginal note in MS A denies Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī the authorship, while attributing the treatise to a certain al-Kaskarī. Consequently, positive indications as to who the author may be can only be found in connection with two names: that of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and that of al-Kaskarī. In the following I will take into consideration the pros and cons of an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and al-Kaskarī respectively.

1 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī

1.1 Life and work

1.1.1 Life

Abū Zakariyyā ibn 'Adī ibn Ḥāmid ibn Zakariyyā at-Takrītī was the most illustrious Christian Arab philosopher and theologian of the 10th century, and he belonged to the Jacobite community of Christians. Much has already been written on Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, and for this reason I will here confine myself to a short summary of what we know of him.¹

According to Ibn al-'Ibrī (Barhebraeus), his place of origin was Takrīt.² This was an important Christian centre by the Tigris about mid-way between Baghdad and Mosul.³ Our knowledge of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's family is confined to a few details about a brother of his called Ibrāhīm ibn 'Adī, who was a close friend of the famous Muslim philosopher Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (d. 950).⁴ al-Fārābī dictated his commentary on Aristotle's

¹ The most important Arabic sources for our knowledge of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī may be found in al-Mas'ūdī, *Tanbih*, 122/10-14; an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/5-14 (Dodge 2, 631); at-Tawḥīdī, *al-Muqābasāt*, 103/2-16 (§ 13), 104/2-105/5 (§ 14), 204/9-205/12 (§ 48), 207/2-208/13 (§ 49); at-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-tmtā'* 1, 37/6-9, 2, 38/13-17; al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, 90/6-11; al-Bayhaqī, *Ta'rikh*, 97/4-11; al-Qifī, *Ta'rikh*, 361/8-364/2; Ibn al-'Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 93/19, 296/19-297/7; and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 235/9-28. Important secondary literature on Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī includes Graf, *Philosophie und Gotteslehre*, *passim*, but especially 1-47; Périer, *Yaḥyā*, *passim*; Meyerhof, *Von Alexandrien nach Baghdad*, 417-419; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 233-249; *ISCH* 1, 161-165; Samir, *Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī*, *passim*; Platti, *Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, philosophe et théologien*, *passim*; Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, *passim*.

² This may be inferred from the *nisba* attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī by Ibn al-'Ibrī in his *Mukhtaṣar*, 296/19-297/1.

³ For details on Takrīt, cf. Fiey, *Tagrit*.

Analytica posteriora to Ibrāhīm, his student in Aleppo.⁵ Ibrāhīm ibn 'Adī is also said to have made a collection of al-Fārābī's works.⁶ Two of Yahyā ibn 'Adī's treatises relate to his brother though they are no longer extant.⁷

In Baghdad, Yahyā ibn 'Adī was taught philosophy by the Nestorian logician Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus (d. 940) as well as by Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī.⁸ According to al-Bayhaqī,⁹ he was the most excellent of al-Fārābī's students. When Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus had died in 940 and al-Fārābī had left Baghdad for Aleppo and Damascus, where he died in 950,¹⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī became the leading philosopher of his time in Baghdad.¹¹ At the age of 81, Yahyā ibn 'Adī passed away on the 13th of August 974 and was buried in the church of St. Thomas the Apostle in Qaṭī'at ar-Raḳīq in Baghdad.¹²

1.1.2 Works

The works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī include some 130 items covering a wide range of philosophical and theological subjects.¹³ About one third of these works are no longer extant, and of those titles which have come down to us only about another third of the total number has been published.

Besides being the author of treatises on propaedeutics and logic,¹⁴ physics and mathematics,¹⁵ metaphysics,¹⁶ ethics,¹⁷ and medicine,¹⁸

⁴ al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, 102/1-7.

⁵ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 139/19-20.

⁶ al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, 102/3.

⁷ One is a controversy on the proposition that the body is substance and accident: al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 363/14-15. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 49f. (no. 3.33), and Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 49 (no. 42). The other is a reply to Ibrāhīm ibn 'Adī: al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 363/15. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 98 (no. 7.4), and Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 49 (no. 43).

⁸ an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/7 (Dodge 2, 631); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 235/10; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 361/10-11; Ibn al-'Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 296/2.

⁹ al-Bayhaqī, *Tatimma*, 90/6.

¹⁰ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 279/2-6.

¹¹ an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/4 (Dodge 2, 631); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 235/9-10; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 361/9-10; Ibn al-'Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 297/1-2; at-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-imtā'* I, 37/7; al-Mas'ūdī, *Tanbih*, 122/10ff.

¹² Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 235/19-20; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḳh*, 363/18-20; Ibn al-'Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 297/5-7.

¹³ Cf. the lists of titles in Endress, *Works*, VII-XII *et passim*, and Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 47-57.

¹⁴ Cf. Endress, *Works*, 42-52 (nos. 3.1-3.5).

¹⁵ Cf. Endress, *Works*, 53-65 (nos. 4.1-4.5).

¹⁶ Cf. Endress, *Works*, 66-81 (nos. 5.1-5.3).

Yahyā ibn 'Adī was also a prolific Christian theologian who dealt with the Unity and Trinity of God,¹⁹ the Incarnation of Christ and the critique of Nestorianism,²⁰ the truth of the Gospel and exegesis of some scriptural verses,²¹ and Christian worship and practice.²²

He is attributed with having translated, or revised the translations of, Plato's *Leges*,²³ and *Timaeus*;²⁴ Aristotle's *Categoriae*,²⁵ *Topica*,²⁶ *Sophistichī elenchi*,²⁷ *Physica*,²⁸ *De anima*,²⁹ books L and M of *Metaphysica*,³⁰ *Poetica*,³¹ Theophrastus' *Metaphysica*,³² Alexander of Aphrodisias' *In Aristotelis Categorias commentaria*,³³ *In Aristotelis Physica commentaria*,³⁴ *In Aristotelis De caelo commentaria*,³⁵ *In Aristotelis Meteora commentaria*,³⁶ Themistius' *In*

17 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 82-86 (nos. 6.1-6.3).

18 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 124 (no. 9.1).

19 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 99-106 (nos. 8.11-8.19.3).

20 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 106-111 (nos. 8.2-8.3).

21 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 114-118 (nos. 8.4-8.5).

22 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 118-120 (nos. 8.61-8.65).

23 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 246/5 (Dodge 2, 593); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 17/20. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 25 (no. 1.11).

24 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 246/12 (Dodge 2, 593); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 18/5. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 25 (no. 1.12).

25 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 248/24 (Dodge 2, 599); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 35/10. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 25 (no. 1.21).

26 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 249/15-21 (Dodge 2, 600-601); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 36/18, 37/1-7; Cf. Endress, *Works*, 25-26 (no. 1.22).

27 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 249/27 (Dodge 2, 601); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 37/14. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 26-27 (no. 1.23).

28 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 250/8-11 (Dodge 2, 602); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 38/10-15. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 27 (no. 1.24).

29 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 27 (no. 1.25).

30 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 251/26 (Dodge 2, 606); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 41/23. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 27-28 (no. 1.26).

31 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 250/4 (Dodge 2, 602); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 38/4. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 28 (no. 1.27).

32 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 252/9 (Dodge 2, 607); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 107/4. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 28 (no. 1.31).

33 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 248/24 (Dodge 2, 599); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 35/10. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 28 (no. 1.41).

34 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 250/8-11 (Dodge 2, 602); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 38/10-15. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 29 (no. 1.42).

35 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/1 (Dodge 2, 630); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḵh*, 323/16. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 29 (no. 1.43).

Aristotelis De caelo paraphrasis;³⁷ Olympiodorus' *In Aristotelis De generatione et corruptione commentaria*;³⁸ and Cassianus Bassus Scholasticus' *Geoponica*.³⁹ The only translation which has both survived and been published is that of Aristotle's *Sophistici elenchi*.⁴⁰

Yahyā ibn 'Adī also wrote commentaries on Aristotle's *Organon*,⁴¹ *Categoriae*,⁴² *De interpretatione*,⁴³ *Analytica*,⁴⁴ *Topica*,⁴⁵ *Physica*,⁴⁶ *De caelo*,⁴⁷ *Metaphysica A*;⁴⁸ Porphyrius' *Isagoge*;⁴⁹ and Alexander of Aphrodisias' *Quaestio II* 28.⁵⁰

As we see, Yahyā ibn 'Adī was a diligent writer, translator and commentator, but he was no less industrious as a copyist. According to an-Nadīm, Yahyā had imposed upon himself the task of writing at least a hundred leaves every day and night.⁵¹

1.1.3 Impact

The teaching of Yahyā ibn 'Adī was pursued and transmitted by some of his colleagues and pupils, the most important being the Muslim philosopher Abū Sulaymān as-Sijistānī (d. after 990),⁵² the Jacobite Christian 'Isā ibn Zur'a (d.1008),⁵³ and al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār ibn al-Khammār (d. after

36 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 251/9 (Dodge 2, 604); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 41/5. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 29 (no. 1.44).

37 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 250/30 (Dodge 2, 603); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 40/3. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 29-30 (no. 1.51).

38 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 251/5 (Dodge 2, 604); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 40/20. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 30 (no. 1.61).

39 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 30-31 (no. 1.71).

40 Badawī, *Mantiq Aristū* 3, 737-1014.

41 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 32 (no. 2.10).

42 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 32-33 (no. 2.11).

43 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 33 (no. 2.12).

44 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 33-34 (no. 2.13).

45 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 34 (no. 2.14).

46 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 35-38 (no. 2.21).

47 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 38 (no. 2.22).

48 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 38-39 (no. 2.31).

49 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 34 (no. 2.16).

50 Cf. Endress, *Works*, 39-41 (no. 2.41).

51 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/9-10 (Dodge 2, 631); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 235/16-17; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 361/16-17.

52 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/15-18 (Dodge 2, 632); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 282-283; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 321-322. Cf. Kraemer, *Philosophy*, *passim*.

53 an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 264/19-27 (Dodge 2, 632); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'riḫ*, 245; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 235. Cf. Haddad, 'Isā ibn Zur'a, *passim*.

1017).⁵⁴

Yahyā ibn 'Adī's impact on later Christian Arabic literature is immense. His doctrines on the Unity and Trinity are echoed in such Nestorian authors as Abū l-Faraj 'Abdallāh ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib⁵⁵ and Elia of Nisibis.⁵⁶ In the Coptic tradition the role of Yahyā is even greater. May it suffice to mention the theological *Summa* or *Kitāb majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* by al-Mu'taman ad-Dawla Abū l-shāq Ibrāhīm ibn al-'Assāl (13th century),⁵⁷ where Yahyā's name is frequently cited and lengthy extracts from his works are quoted,⁵⁸ Abū Shākīr ibn Buṭrus ar-Rāhib (13th century),⁵⁹ and Abū l-Barakāt ibn Kabar (d. 1324).⁶⁰

1.2 Arguments for an attribution to Yahyā ibn 'Adī

The most obvious indication for an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Yahyā ibn 'Adī is the incontestable fact that the treatise is ascribed to Yahyā in the manuscript tradition. It is contained in a volume devoted to works by Yahyā ibn 'Adī, and it carries his name in the heading (§ 2). Unfortunately, however, incorrect attributions do occur in the transmission of Christian Arabic literature and are, of course, quite conceivable in connection with great names such as Yahyā ibn 'Adī's. In fact, one of the other treatises in the very same collection of works by Yahyā is most probably spurious, namely *Kitāb al-burhān fī d-dīn*, which is the first treatise in the collection.⁶¹ If we add to this the fact that a marginal note doubts the traditional attribution, we realize that we have to look for similarities

⁵⁴ an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 265/1-10 (Dodge 2, 632-633); al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 164; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 322-323.

⁵⁵ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 223/5-20; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 239/19-241/20; Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 653 (684f.). Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 160-176; *ISCH* 2 (1976), 203-208; Graf, *Philosophie und Gotteslehre*, 48-51.

⁵⁶ For details in his *vita*, cf. the *continuator* of his chronological work in Elia of Nisibis, *Opus chronologicum*, 228/14-229/8; Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 651 (682f.). Cf. Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 266-275; Delly, *La théologie, passim*; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 177-189; *ISCH* 3 (1977), 257-284; Graf, *Philosophie und Gotteslehre*, 52-56.

⁵⁷ Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 660 (695). Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 407-414.

⁵⁸ Cf. Platti, *Compilation*, *passim*; Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 36-46.

⁵⁹ Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 662 (699). Cf. Sidarus, *Ibn ar-Rāhib, passim*; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 428-434; Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 46-47.

⁶⁰ Cf. Riedel, *Katalog*, 635-639; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 438-444; Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 47-50.

⁶¹ MS A, foll. 1r-37v; MS B, foll. 7r-60v; MS C, foll. 4r-50r; MS D, foll. 2v-55r; MS E, foll. 3v-58v. Two additional manuscripts containing this work are MS *Egypt, St. Antony, Theol.* 131 (A. D. 1904) and MS *Egypt, St. Antony, Theol.* 321 (A. D. 1888) [Cf. Holmberg, *al-Kaskarī and as-Sukkarī*, 220]. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 105 (no. 8.18). For the probable inauthenticity of this treatise, cf. Platti, *Deux manuscrits*, 218-219, and Platti, *Cosmologie*, 75-77.

between the treatise and the indisputably authentic works of Yahyā with regard to concepts and the use of technical terms. The resemblances, in this respect, which may be regarded as more significant than being mere commonplaces to be found anywhere in Christian Arabic literature, are easily enumerated.

1.2.1 The image of a ship on a river

In § 19b of the treatise the author illustrates the unreliability of sensual perception by reminding the reader of a person who is travelling by ship on the Tigris river and erroneously perceives of the river bank with its plantations and buildings as moving, though in reality it is the person himself who is moving by virtue of being on a moving ship.

A similar image of a ship occurs at least twice in the works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī, but in a more refined version and with a different implication.⁶² While in our treatise the image is drawn as an argument for the unreliability of sensual perception, in Yahyā the idea is to argue that one and the same object can be described by contrary or contradictory attributes at the same time, but from different points of view.

In the first of the two instances where Yahyā ibn 'Adī uses the analogy of the ship, he argues as follows.⁶³ A person sitting on a ship is at rest with regard to himself (ساكن بنفسه), given the fact that he does not move from one place to another on the ship. But at the same time we may say that he is moving by way of accident (متحرك بالعرض), or by virtue of a movement which is not his own (بحركة غيره), given the fact that the ship is moving from one country to another. Consequently, the person is at the same time moving and at rest or motionless. In a parallel way Christ may be described as both human and divine.

In the second instance, Yahyā's concern is once more to defend a Christian doctrine from the accusation of being contradictory, this time the Trinitarian doctrine.⁶⁴ The goods on a ship are motionless, if they do not change positions on the ship, but are at the same time moving, since they participate in the motion of the ship. As the goods are both moving and motionless at the same time, but in different perspectives, so the Creator is both one, i.e. with regard to the substance, and three, i.e. with regard to the properties, at the same time.

⁶² Once in Yahyā ibn 'Adī's *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 18/6-11; and again in his *Tabyīn ghalat Abī 'Isā al-Warrāq*, foll. 18v-19r. Cf. Périer, *Yahyā*, 168; Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 837; Wolfson, *al-Kindī*, 60-61; Wolfson, *Kalām*, 333.

⁶³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 18/6-11.

⁶⁴ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat Abī 'Isā al-Warrāq*, foll. 18v-19r.

1.2.2 The three levels of existence

Another instance of similarity between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī is the tripartite ontological and epistemological diaeresis in §§ 16-57. In § 16, the author declares that things exist on three levels (منازل), or according to three manners.

First, there are things below reason (تحت العقل), and of them knowledge may be achieved by way of sensual perception of particulars (§§ 16-20).

Secondly, there is the level of reason, or, what is "together with reason" (مع العقل), where the mind gives its opinion on the universals and the substrates on which the sense-perceived objects depend (§§ 21-42).

Finally, there are things above reason (فوق العقل) of which knowledge may only be achieved inductively (§§ 43-57).

In at least four of Yahyā ibn 'Adī's treatises similar ontological and/or epistemological divisions may be found.⁶⁵ The closest parallel appears in his *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-arba'a al-'ilmiyya*,⁶⁶ where a tripartite division may be discerned. The first kind of knowledge is sensual perception (حس), which may be either real or illusive.⁶⁷ The second kind of knowledge is attained by reason (بالعقل).⁶⁸ The third kind of knowledge is called فكر ("reflection") and is attained by syllogistic reasoning from the premisses of already acquired knowledge.⁶⁹

Having given an account of these three kinds of knowledge, Yahyā ibn 'Adī goes on to deal with the possible errors which impair the three kinds of knowledge.⁷⁰ This may be compared to *Risāla fī tathbīt*, where the unreliability of human knowledge is contrasted with divine transcendence throughout §§ 15-57.

In Yahyā ibn 'Adī's account, the expressions مع العقل ، تحت العقل and فوق العقل of *Risāla fī tathbīt*⁷¹ do not occur, though his use of بالعقل⁷² may be compared to مع العقل. But in another treatise of his - *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim* - we have an interesting occurrence of the expression دون العقل, or, according to one of the manuscripts,⁷³

⁶⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 311-324; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-arba'a al-'ilmiyya*, 99/14-100/7; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-'ilmiyya al-arba'a* (according to Endress, *Works*, 67 (no. 5.12)); and Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn* (according to Endress, *Works*, 67-69 (no. 5.13)).

⁶⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-arba'a al-'ilmiyya*, 99/14-100/7.

⁶⁷ Cf. the role of تخيل in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 18-19.

⁶⁸ Cf. مع العقل *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 21.

⁶⁹ Cf. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 43-57.

⁷⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-arba'a al-'ilmiyya*, 100/8-101/23.

⁷¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 16, 21 and 43.

⁷² Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-buḥūth al-arba'a al-'ilmiyya*, 99/23.

74. تحت العقل In the context, Yaḥyā defends his Monophysite Christology against Nestorian criticism, arguing that the Incarnation, according to Monophysite doctrine, is unique, but nonetheless true. The Eternal Son becoming man cannot be compared to either water becoming air, white becoming black, stones becoming a house, or vinegar and honey becoming oxymel when they are mixed. This is true, but even the Nestorians - Yaḥyā continues - believe that the exact mode (كيفية) of the birth of the Eternal Son from the Father is unique and incomparable to any other kind of birth that we know of, and yet it is true. Yaḥyā summarizes his argument in the following words:⁷⁵

وبالجملة فانا لا نعرف نحوه له مفهوماً منا
مدروكاً لنا بالنحو الذي يدرك الاشياء التي هي
دون [تحت:] العقل [var.:] يمكننا ان نقول ان ولادة
الابن الازلي من الآب الازلي به وبحسبه.

It goes without saying that the expression الاشياء التي هي دون العقل, or better العقل تحت according to MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 115*, is a striking parallel to العقل تحت ما كان in § 16 of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

1.2.3 على التقريب والتمثيل Approximation and the formula

I would like to draw attention to a third instance of similarity, or even identity of expression between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī. If we turn to the twelfth and final point of dispute in *Risāla fī tathbīt* (§§ 215-220), we find the author explaining the relevance of some Trinitarian analogies. According to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, a Trinitarian analogy is a sign (علامة) which by no means corresponds with the Trinity in every respect. But through the analogy we may seek information about God in an approximative and comparative way (على التقريب والتمثيل).⁷⁶

Earlier in the treatise, in § 120, the author also talks about an approximation with regard to divine truths when he states that the intelligent may obtain insight into the truth, and, in the manner of one who seeks guidance, make an approximation (يقرب) by means of the method of

⁷³ MS *Vat. ar. 115*.

⁷⁴ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 29/12.

⁷⁵ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 29/11-13. Platti's translation does not make sense: "Et en somme, nous ne lui connaissons pas de mode qui nous soit compréhensible et qui nous permette de dire que la naissance du Fils éternel du Père éternel se soit faite de telle ou telle façon, car nous le percevons de la même façon qu'on perçoit les choses qui sont irrationnelles" (p. 22/33-38). The italics are mine. The words الاشياء التي هي دون العقل do not mean "the things which are irrational", but rather "the things which are below the ratio, i.e. the objects of sensory perception."

⁷⁶ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 217.

inferential reasoning according to the rules of language.

The idea of approximating the truth, especially in the context of analogies, we also find in the genuine works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī. In his *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, for instance, Yahyā comments on the use of the Trinitarian analogy of the sun with its radiation of heat and light - as is also the case in §§ 215-220 in *Risāla fī tathbīt* - by stating:⁷⁷

إنما هو مثال يمثل به بعض متكلمي النصارى
ليقرب به ما يقولونه من أن يوجد في الموجودات الطاهرة
ما هو واحد من جهة وأكثر من واحد من جهة أخرى.

This idea of an approximative function of analogies is not exclusive to Yahyā ibn 'Adī, but may be found elsewhere in Christian Arabic literature.⁷⁸ More conclusive, though, is the fact that the very same formula *على التقريب والتمثيل* in § 217 in *Risāla fī tathbīt* also occurs in at least two of Yahyā ibn 'Adī's anti-Nestorian works. In his *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, the context is again that of analogies.⁷⁹ The manner (كيفية) in which the Eternal Son becomes man cannot be conceived of exhaustively (على التحصيل), but only by way of approximation and comparison (على التقريب والتمثيل). In his *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḡalālat an-nastūriyya*, Yahyā also makes use of the formula, either exactly as quoted above,⁸⁰ or without the preposition *على*⁸¹ or slightly modified in some other way.⁸²

1.3 Arguments against an attribution to Yahyā ibn 'Adī

The most easily grasped indication of a false attribution to Yahyā ibn 'Adī is no doubt the marginal note which states that "this treatise is by al-Kaskarī and Yahyā's treatise on the Unity is another one".⁸³ The person who wrote the marginal note was probably acquainted with Yahyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*⁸⁴ and had realized the obvious difference between the two treatises. What basis he had for attributing the treatise to al-Kaskarī we do not know.⁸⁵

The doubt expressed in the marginal note is corroborated by the fact that *Risāla fī tathbīt* is not mentioned in any list of works attributed to Yahyā ibn 'Adī, nor is it quoted - as far as I know - in the Coptic tradition

⁷⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 39/4-5. Note the word *ليقرب*.

⁷⁸ For instance in Sim'an ibn Kalil ibn Maqāra, *Maqāla fī waḥdāniyyat al-Bārī*, 107/13-15.

⁷⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 29/4. Cf. Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 114-115.

⁸⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḡalālat an-nastūriyya*, 194/13-14, 195/15-16, and 196/11-12.

⁸¹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḡalālat an-nastūriyya*, 194/14, and 196/12 for instance.

⁸² Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḡalālat an-nastūriyya*, 195/4, 7, 18 and 196/19-20 for instance.

⁸³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 2 (note no. 4/MS A).

⁸⁴ Ed. in Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 157-277.

⁸⁵ For al-Kaskarī see pp. 42-106 below.

where, as already mentioned,⁸⁶ lengthy quotations from the works of Yaḥyā are to be found. It must be admitted, however, that this is the case even with other treatises attributed to Yaḥyā.

More conclusive are the arguments which may be advanced from a comparison of terminology, style and doctrinal statements, as they are found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, with what we find in other works attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī. Without any pretension to mentioning all the dissimilarities and without being able to support my statements with comprehensive statistical investigations of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's vast literary production, I venture to mention some of the most conspicuous differences in this respect.

1.3.1 Philosophical terms and stylistic expressions

Some of the philosophical terms and stylistic expressions common in *Risāla fī tathbīt* rarely occur in other works attributed to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and vice versa.

1.3.1.1 عَيْن

The philosophical term عَيْن, for instance, which occurs 30 times in *Risāla fī tathbīt*,⁸⁷ usually meaning "substance", "individual" etc., is hardly ever found in this sense in the works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.⁸⁸ In fact, the only occurrence I have come across is found in a reference made by Gerhard Endress⁸⁹ to Yaḥyā's treatise *Mā kataba ilā Abī 'Amr Sa'd ibn az-Zaynabī [?] ibn Sa'īd*, which is still unpublished.⁹⁰ The term عَيْن - in this context meaning الجوهر دون العرض, or, "the substance without regard to the accidents"⁹¹ - here appears in an assertion which Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī strongly attacks, namely "that (with regard to creation) there is no difference between substances (al-'ayn ...) and acts".⁹² The occurrence of عَيْن in this sense here, consequently, does not necessarily imply that Yaḥyā really approved of it and would have used it himself.

According to al-Khwārizmī,⁹³ the first category, οὐσία (primary or individual substance), in Aristotle's *Categoriae*, was rendered by عَيْن in

⁸⁶ Cf. p. 21 above.

⁸⁷ See the vocable عَيْن in the word index.

⁸⁸ For the meaning of عَيْن as a philosophical term, cf. van den Bergh, 'Ayn, *passim*; Goichon, *Lexique*, 257-258 (no. 474).

⁸⁹ Endress, *Works*, 79-80.

⁹⁰ Cf. Endress, *Works*, 78-81 (no. 5.36).

⁹¹ Endress, *Works*, 79-80.

⁹² Endress, *Works*, 79-80.

⁹³ al-Khwārizmī, *Mafāṭih al-'ulūm*, 143.

the old translation of 'Abdallāh ibn al-Muqaffa'.⁹⁴ In Ishāq ibn Hunayn's later translation of *Categoriae*,⁹⁵ the word عَيْن is replaced by جوهر, a Persian word which from then on becomes the technical term for all the meanings of οὐσία,⁹⁶ though عَيْن is still used in a less technical sense to designate concrete things or individuals, for instance by Ibn Sīnā.⁹⁷

In *Risāla fī tathbīt* the word عَيْن is used in roughly two contexts. First, the author uses it in speaking about the relation between God and his creatures (§§ 124, 145). Here the word is paralleled with معنى, "concept", "reality", and opposed to اسم, "name". Secondly, and this is the main context, the word عَيْن is used in connection with the Trinitarian doctrine. In this context the word designates both the different hypostases of the Godhead,⁹⁸ as well as the one and single substance of God.⁹⁹ This apparently ambiguous use of عَيْن is, however, quite consistent with the author's doctrine that the Creator is one according to species (نوع)¹⁰⁰ and shows that عَيْن in a way roughly corresponds to Aristotle's use of οὐσία as both primary and secondary substance.¹⁰¹

1.3.1.2 ماهية

Another very common philosophical term in *Risāla fī tathbīt* is ماهية, "what-ness", "essence" etc., which occurs 42 times,¹⁰² but is fairly rare in other works attributed to Yahyā ibn 'Adī.¹⁰³ In Yahyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, for instance, this word is only met with twice.¹⁰⁴ And in the nine treatises by Yahyā which Augustin Périer edited,¹⁰⁵ it appears only ten times altogether, and only in three of the nine treatises.¹⁰⁶

94 On this translation of Aristotle's *Categoriae*, cf. Badawī, *La transmission*, 75.

95 Badawī, *Manṭiq Aristū* I, 33-76. For other editions, cf. Badawī, *La transmission*, 75.

96 Cf. van den Bergh, 'Ayn, 784.

97 Cf. Goichon, *Lexique*, 257.

98 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 148, 155, 172, 173 (twice), 200, 202(twice), and 215 (twice).

99 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 157, 166, 203 (twice), 208, and 211(twice).

100 E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168.

101 Aristotle, *Categoriae*, 2a/11ff.

102 See the vocable ماهية in the word-index.

103 For the meaning of ماهية, cf. Goichon, *Lexique*, 386-387 (no. 679).

104 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 310 and 323.

105 Périer, *Petits traités, passim*; and Périer, *Un traité*, 4-14.

106 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 41/5,7; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī wujūb at-ta'annus*, 77/6 (twice); 78/5,6; 82/8; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/15, 18, 20.

1.3.1.3 من البين

I now turn to a stylistic expression which is common in most of Yahyā ibn 'Adī's works, but totally absent in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. The stylistic device I have in mind is من البين ("it is evident.."). It occurs eight times in Yahyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*,¹⁰⁷ fifteen times in the treatises edited by Périer,¹⁰⁸ four times in *Maqāla fī l-mawjūdāt*,¹⁰⁹ and eight times in Yahyā's treatise on the relation between logic and grammar,¹¹⁰ to mention but a few examples. The expression also constantly recurs throughout Yahyā's polemical works against the Nestorians,¹¹¹ although I have not counted the number of instances.

1.3.2 Doctrinal differences

Having mentioned a few terminological and stylistic discrepancies between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and some other works attributed to Yahyā ibn 'Adī, I now turn to some doctrinal differences.

1.3.2.1 The triads of divine attributes

In *Risāla fī tathbīt* the triad of divine attributes - used in order to conceptualize philosophically the Christian Trinitarian mystery - is ¹¹² موجود/وجود - حي/حياة - ناطق/نطق which is a triad not to be met with in the indisputably genuine corpus of Yahyā ibn 'Adī. In this corpus two other triads predominate. In his treatise on the Unity, Yahyā uses the triad ¹¹³ قدرة - جود - حكمة twice with ¹¹⁴ حول instead of ¹¹⁵ قدرة. The same triad also appears in other treatises, such as *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*,¹¹⁵ *Maqāla fī l-mawjūdāt*,¹¹⁶ *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*,¹¹⁷ and

¹⁰⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 33, 137, 274, 278, 322, 336, 340, and 348.

¹⁰⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī shiḥat i'tiqād an-Naṣārā*, 12/6; 13/1,7; 18/7,8; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 33/6; 34/7; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn al-wajh*, 48/9; 49/4; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an mas'ala*, 66/1; 67/2; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī wujūb at-ta'annus*, 76/3; 80/2,3; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī ghalat man yaqūl*, 110/4. It should be noted, though, that the expression does not occur in Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*.

¹⁰⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-mawjūdāt*, 153/4,18; 154/2; 155/26.

¹¹⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn al-faṣl*, 39/5; 42/5; 43/10; 47/7,13,14; 48/11; 49/7.

¹¹¹ Ed. by Platti in *La grande polémique*, and in *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 1-68 (Arabic part).

¹¹² E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 153-155.

¹¹³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 370, 371, 373, 376.

¹¹⁴ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 378, 416.

¹¹⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 12/15; 14/4-5.

¹¹⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī l-mawjūdāt*, 152/6.

Jawāb 'an mas'ala.¹¹⁸ The slightly varied triad جود - حكمة - حول reappears in *Jawāb 'an masā'il*.¹¹⁹

But the triad most peculiar to Yahyā ibn 'Adī, and the one commonly associated with his name, is the triad عقل - عاقل - معقول,¹²⁰ which he was probably the first to use in Christian Arabic literature.¹²¹ The wide use of this triad after Yahyā ibn 'Adī is a token of the impact of the Baghdadian master on later Christian Arabic literature.¹²²

1.3.2.2 The doctrine of divine Unity

Another theological, or philosophical, discrepancy between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the genuine works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī becomes evident when we compare what is said about the different ways in which "one" (الواحد) may be expressed, and in what way the Creator may be said to be one.

On this point *Risāla fī tathbīt* is very clear: "one" is expressed in three ways, namely, "one" according to genus (جنس), "one" according to species (نوع), and "one" according to individual (شخص),¹²³ and the manner in which the Creator is said to be one is according to species.¹²⁴

In the corpus of Yahyā ibn 'Adī there are also clear statements with regard to this issue. In his *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, Yahyā enumerates six categories of "one" (أقسام الواحد),¹²⁵ and six modes of "one" (جهات الواحد).¹²⁶ These categories and modes of "one" correspond to the categories and modes of plurality (الكثرة).¹²⁷ As for the categories of

¹¹⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/18, 21.

¹¹⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an mas'ala*, 66/1.

¹¹⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 43/1-2.

¹²⁰ To be found, for instance, in Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tamthīl an-Naṣārā*, *passim*; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī ṣiḥḥat i'tiqād an-Naṣārā*, 18-21 (*passim*); Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat Abī 'Isā al-Warrāq*, foll. 9r/7-10; 35r/13-37r/2 (*passim*). For this triad, cf. also Graf, *Philosophie und Gotteslehre*, 24-28; and Périer, *Yahyā*, 160-167.

¹²¹ Cf. Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 129.

¹²² See for instance Ibn Zur'a, *Maqāla 'an at-tathlīth*, 69-71 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Radd 'alā l-Balkhī*, 63-66 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Maqāla li-Bishr ibn Finhās*, 39/15 and 38/15-40/9 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Risāla fī ma'ānin*, 9-10 (*passim*); Ibn at-Tayyib, *Maqāla fī t-tathlīth wa-t-tawhīd*, 113/3ff. ('ilm - 'ālim - ma'lūm); Muḥyī d-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *Kalām fī l-'aql*, 59-61 (*passim*); ar-Rashīd ibn at-Tayyib, *Tiryāq al-'uqūl*, 176-177; aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Fuṣūl mukhtaṣara*, 704 (chap. 5:8).

¹²³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 59-62, 99-101.

¹²⁴ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168.

¹²⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 149-176.

¹²⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 177-179: one in act (بالفعل, § 181) or one in potentiality (بالقوة, § 182); one in subject (في الموضوع, § 183) or one in definition (في الحد, § 185); and one in essence (في الذات, § 186) or one in accident (بالعرض, § 187).

Jawāb 'an mas'ala.¹¹⁸ The slightly varied triad جود - حكمة - حول reappears in *Jawāb 'an masā'il*.¹¹⁹

But the triad most peculiar to Yahyā ibn 'Adī, and the one commonly associated with his name, is the triad عقل - عاقل - معقول,¹²⁰ which he was probably the first to use in Christian Arabic literature.¹²¹ The wide use of this triad after Yahyā ibn 'Adī is a token of the impact of the Baghdadian master on later Christian Arabic literature.¹²²

1.3.2.2 The doctrine of divine Unity

Another theological, or philosophical, discrepancy between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the genuine works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī becomes evident when we compare what is said about the different ways in which "one" (الواحد) may be expressed, and in what way the Creator may be said to be one.

On this point *Risāla fī tathbīt* is very clear: "one" is expressed in three ways, namely, "one" according to genus (جنس), "one" according to species (نوع), and "one" according to individual (شخص),¹²³ and the manner in which the Creator is said to be one is according to species.¹²⁴

In the corpus of Yahyā ibn 'Adī there are also clear statements with regard to this issue. In his *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, Yahyā enumerates six categories of "one" (أقسام الواحد),¹²⁵ and six modes of "one" (جهات الواحد).¹²⁶ These categories and modes of "one" correspond to the categories and modes of plurality (الكثرة).¹²⁷ As for the categories of

¹¹⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/18, 21.

¹¹⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an mas'ala*, 66/1.

¹¹⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 43/1-2.

¹²⁰ To be found, for instance, in Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tamthīl an-Naṣārā*, *passim*; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī ṣiḥḥat i'tiqād an-Naṣārā*, 18-21 (*passim*), Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat Abī 'Isā al-Warrāq*, foll. 9r/7-10; 35r/13-37r/2 (*passim*). For this triad, cf. also Graf, *Philosophie und Gotteslehre*, 24-28; and Périer, *Yahyā*, 160-167.

¹²¹ Cf. Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 129.

¹²² See for instance Ibn Zur'a, *Maqāla 'an at-tathlīth*, 69-71 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Radd 'alā l-Balkhī*, 63-66 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Maqāla li-Bishr ibn Finḥās*, 39/15 and 38/15-40/9 (*passim*); Ibn Zur'a, *Risāla fī ma'ānin*, 9-10 (*passim*); Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib, *Maqāla fī t-tathlīth wa-t-tawhīd*, 113/3ff. ('ilm - 'ālim - ma'lūm); Muḥyī d-Dīn al-Iṣfahānī, *Kalām fī l-'aql*, 59-61 (*passim*); ar-Rashīd ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib, *Tiryāq al-'uqūl*, 176-177; aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Fuṣūl mukhtaṣara*, 704 (chap. 5:8).

¹²³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 59-62, 99-101.

¹²⁴ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168.

¹²⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 149-176.

¹²⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 177-179: one in act (بالفعل, § 181) or one in potentiality (بالقوة, § 182); one in subject (في الموضوع, § 183) or one in definition (في الحد, § 185); and one in essence (في الذات, § 186) or one in accident (بالعرض, § 187).

"one", they are "one" in genus (جنس),¹²⁸ "one" in species (نوع),¹²⁹ "one" in relation (نسبة),¹³⁰ "one" as continuous (متصل),¹³¹ "one" through definition (حد),¹³² and "one" as indivisible (غير منقسم).¹³³ The three latter categories all come under "one" according to number (عدد).¹³⁴

If we compare this division of the categories of "one" with what we find in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, we note that the first two categories (i.e. genus and species) coincide in the two divisions. As for the third category in *Risāla fī tathbīt* (i.e. individual), it obviously corresponds to what Yaḥyā calls "one" according to number. By subdividing this last category into three other categories (i.e. continuous, definition and indivisible), Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī in his treatise on the unity provides us with a division into six categories which is more elaborate and subtle than the division into three categories of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

In his refutation of al-Kindī's book against the Christians, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī also argues for a more varied analysis of the ways in which "one" may be said.¹³⁵ According to al-Kindī, as quoted by Yaḥyā, "one" may be said in three ways: "one" in number (عدد), "one" in species (نوع), and "one" in genus (جنس).¹³⁶ If the Creator is one, he must be one in one of these three ways. In replying to this challenge, Yaḥyā disapproves of al-Kindī's division on the grounds that it is incomplete.¹³⁷ Yaḥyā reproaches al-Kindī for having omitted to state that "one" may also be said with regard to relation (نسبة),¹³⁸ and that the category of number (عدد) may be subdivided into what is "one" by virtue of being continuous (متصل),¹³⁹ what is "one" by being indivisible (ما لا ينقسم),¹⁴⁰ and what is "one" by virtue of a common definition (أشياء التي القول الدال على ماهيتها).¹⁴¹ Further, Yaḥyā adds that "one" may be said in the sense of one in subject (موضوع) and many in definitions (حدود),¹⁴² as well as one in

¹²⁷ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 190-212.

¹²⁸ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 150.

¹²⁹ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 150.

¹³⁰ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 151.

¹³¹ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 153-159.

¹³² Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 160-161.

¹³³ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 162-175.

¹³⁴ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 152.

¹³⁵ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/4ff.

¹³⁶ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 11/3ff.

¹³⁷ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/6.

¹³⁸ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/7-10.

¹³⁹ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/11-13.

¹⁴⁰ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/13-14.

¹⁴¹ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/14-16.

¹⁴² Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 13/4-7.

definition and many in subjects.¹⁴³ By giving additional senses in which "one" may be said, Yahyā disapproves of the tripartite division of al-Kindī which corresponds to the division in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

Turning to the question of which category of "one" is applicable to the Creator, we may likewise observe a disagreement between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the treatises by Yahyā ibn 'Adī cited above. While in *Risāla fī tathbīt* the Creator is said to be one as species (نوع),¹⁴⁴ Yahyā explicitly disapproves of this.¹⁴⁵ God cannot be one as species (or genus), because species (and genera) need individuals in order to exist, or, in other words, individuals are the causes of their existence, but the First Cause cannot possibly be caused.¹⁴⁶ The categories of "one", approved of by Yahyā with regard to the First Cause or the Creator are "one" in definition¹⁴⁷ - the definition being "benevolent, wise and mighty"¹⁴⁸ - and "one" in subject, "many" in definitions.¹⁴⁹

1.3.2.3 The dialectics of propositions and terms

A recurring feature of Yahyā ibn 'Adī's method of reasoning and arguing is his insistence on what might be called the dialectics of propositions and terms. An example of this is his analysis of the proposition that the Creator is one in his *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*. In this treatise, Yahyā rejects five misconceptions of divine Unity¹⁵⁰ and approves of the statement that God is one in one respect and many in another respect (واحد من جهة) (وكثير من جهة أخرى).¹⁵¹ As already mentioned,¹⁵² Yahyā takes into consideration both the categories (أقسام) and the modes (جهات) of unity as well as plurality. As for the categories, he states that the Creator is both one and many in definition (حد).¹⁵³ This statement seems to contradict

¹⁴³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 13/8-11.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168.

¹⁴⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 245-249; and Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/4-5.

¹⁴⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 246-248.

¹⁴⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 267-268; and Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/16-18.

¹⁴⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/20-21.

¹⁴⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 13/7-8.

¹⁵⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*: 1. That there is no plurality in God (§§ 4, 18-24); 2. That God is one in the sense that he has no equal (لا نظير له) (§§ 25-80); 3. That God is one in the sense that he is the principle of number (§§ 6-8, 81-101); 4. That God is one in the sense that he possesses unity (وحدة), from which concept everything else which may be called "one" is derived (§§ 9, 102-145); 5. That God is one in all respects (§§ 11, 213-241).

¹⁵¹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 12, 241-268.

¹⁵² See p. 29 above.

Yahyā's own definition of "one":¹⁵⁴

فنقول: إن الواحد هو موجود ما،
لا يوجد فيه غيرية، من حيث هو واحد.

Consequently, he has to explain how God can be both one and many in definition. In solving this problem, Yahyā argues that every definition has two principles, that of unity (وحدة) with regard to its whole (من قبل)، and that of plurality with regard to its parts (أجزائه)، because every definition is a proposition composed of parts indicating independent realities (معاني).¹⁵⁵ In this manner God is one with regard to the definition seen as a whole, but plural, i.e. three, with regard to the parts of the definition (جواد - حكيم - قادر).¹⁵⁶

The formula "in one respect...in another respect", or its equivalent, is very often used by Yahyā when dealing with the challenges of his opponents. In defending the Monophysite Christological doctrine, Yahyā has to explain how Christ can be one single substance (جوهر)، and yet both man and God.¹⁵⁷ This he usually does by drawing analogies from our common experience in order to show that many a single substance may be described by contradictory or contrary attributes at the same time, but from different points of view.

For example, man may be described as both body and not-body, i.e. soul,¹⁵⁸ or as both black, i.e. with regard to the colour of the hair, and white, i.e. with regard to the colour of the body.¹⁵⁹ In a similar way a line (الخط)، though one and single, is both divisible (متجزئ)، when regarded as a line, and indivisible (غير متجزئ)، when regarded as the edge of a surface.¹⁶⁰ Further, Zayd may have a brown complexion, but compared to the Slavs he is black, and compared to the Ethiopians he is white.¹⁶¹ And a person on a ship may be both at rest (ساكن) and moving (متحرك) at the same time, i.e. at rest in essence (بالذات) provided he does not move from one place to another on the ship, and moving by accident (بالعرض) if the ship, for instance, sails from one country to another.¹⁶²

In answering an opponent's question, whether there are any specific

¹⁵³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 267-268, 284-287.

¹⁵⁴ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 148.

¹⁵⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 298-302.

¹⁵⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 371-377.

¹⁵⁷ This is a recurring theme in Yahyā ibn 'Adī's anti-Nestorian works edited by Emilio Platti. Cf. note 111 above.

¹⁵⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 12/1-3.

¹⁵⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 11/17-12/1 (cf. also 18/1-11).

¹⁶⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasna al-Qāsim*, 34/13-17; and 37/12-14.

¹⁶¹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 18/4-6.

¹⁶² Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī I-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 18/6-11. Cf. Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghaibāt Abī Tsā al-Warrāq*, foll. 18v-19r. Cf. also note 62 (p. 22) above.

differences (فصول) between the three hypostases of the Trinity, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī argues that there are such differences in one respect, but not in another.¹⁶³ The same is true of man and horse, for instance: by virtue of being animals (حيوان) there is no specific difference between them, but by virtue of man being rational (ناطق) and the horse being non-rational (غير ناطق) there is a specific difference.¹⁶⁴ This answer should be compared to the corresponding answer to the same challenge in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, where this line of thought is not used.¹⁶⁵

The emphasis on dialectics of propositions and terms, which is typical of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, does not, on the whole, occur in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. In fact, the absurdity of predicating contradictory or contrary attributes to one and the same subject is often emphasized.¹⁶⁶

1.4 An attempt to defend an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī by means of a hypothesis

If we compare the positive indications for an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī with the arguments against such an attribution, we have to admit that the latter arguments outweigh the former. Before finally denying Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, though, we have to ask ourselves if these arguments really are conclusive. Or, is it possible to explain convincingly the differences between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī in one way or another? Such an explanation in the form of a plausible hypothesis is certainly a *sine qua non* for a continued attribution of the treatise to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī. Most, if not all, the discrepancies in the use of philosophical terms, stylistic expressions and doctrinal statements could be explained if we hypothetically assume that *Risāla fī tathbīt* is a very early piece of work, written by Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī before he had developed the style and the philosophical-theological view of his later production. The probability of this hypothesis of course depends on how convincingly it explains the particular discrepancies between this treatise and the indisputably authentic works of Yaḥyā and what results an investigation of the attribution to al-Kaskarī in the marginal note may yield.¹⁶⁷

1.4.1 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and an-Nāshī' al-Akbar

To start with, however, we have to ask ourselves if there is any positive

¹⁶³ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 28/3.

¹⁶⁴ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 29/2-4.

¹⁶⁵ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 205-214.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. for instance *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 69, 72, 93, 95, 104, 109-111, and 107.

¹⁶⁷ See pp. 42-106 below.

evidence which might corroborate the hypothesis that Yahyā ibn 'Adī wrote *Risāla fī tathbīt* at a very early date, many years before most of his other works appeared. I think there is such evidence. We know that Yahyā ibn 'Adī at the age of about thirty in Muḥarram 311 / April-May 925 finished his copy of the Mu'tazilite an-Nāshī' al-Akbar 's (d. 906) *al-Kitāb al-awsaṭ*.¹⁶⁸ The 13th century Copt aṣ-Ṣafī Abū l-Faḍā'il ibn al-'Assāl used Yahyā 's copy of an-Nāshī' 's work when writing his refutation of it.¹⁶⁹ As the person¹⁷⁰ from whom aṣ-Ṣafī borrowed Yahyā 's copy thought, I too consider it a strange circumstance that Yahyā ibn 'Adī should have desisted from refuting an-Nāshī', since it was his custom to refute works of this sort.¹⁷¹

It should be noted that aṣ-Ṣafī, though he could think of reasons for Yahyā not refuting an-Nāshī' - namely, that Yahyā refuted Abū Ṭsā al-Warrāq 's attack on Christianity in a two-volume work of 350 chapters which might do to rebut an-Nāshī' as well, and that Yahyā was still very young when he finished his work, while most of his works are dated from the year 351/962 and later¹⁷² - he nevertheless considers it possible that Yahyā in fact did write something against an-Nāshī' which was lost or unknown.¹⁷³

It is obvious that the refutation of an-Nāshī' is of central importance for the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. Not only is the section in which an-Nāshī' 's position is presented, criticized and ridiculed (§§ 102-118), the most extensive doxographical section dedicated to a single person or school, but the central issue in the author 's refutation of an-Nāshī', namely the relation between God and his creatures and the consequences of this relation for our knowledge of divine truths, is a recurring theme throughout *Risāla fī tathbīt*. While an-Nāshī', according to the author, rejects any relation or participation whatsoever, be it in name (اسم) or in essence (ذات) between the Creator and his creatures (§ 102), the author himself advocates a participation in names and metaphors, but not in realities and substances.¹⁷⁴ This position of the author one might call "an analogy in names" and involves a proper balance between a negative theology and a positive

¹⁶⁸ aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, foll. 31v/19-32r/1.

¹⁶⁹ aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, fol. 31v/12-14.

¹⁷⁰ van Ess takes it for granted that this person was aṣ-Ṣafī 's brother ar-Rashīd Abū l-Majd (van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 61), while it is clear from the text that the brother was only the mediator (الواسطة) when aṣ-Ṣafī borrowed the book from the person in question (aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, fol. 32r/6-7). Cf. Graf 's translation of this passage in his *Gelehrtenfamilie*, 40-41.

¹⁷¹ aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, fol. 31v/15-16.

¹⁷² aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, foll. 31v/16-32r/2.

¹⁷³ aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl, *Radd 'alā n-Nāshī'*, fol. 32r/2-3.

¹⁷⁴ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 124.

theology. The former predominates in §§ 15-53.¹⁷⁵ God is transcendent and true knowledge of him cannot be attained either by sensual perception of particulars (§§ 16-28), or by intellectual discernment of universals (§§ 29-42), or even by deducing statements about him from the signs of his activity (§§ 43-57). The latter is implicitly introduced in opposition to the extreme equivocity of being associated with an-Nāshi' (§§ 102-118) and further developed in the last part of the treatise where the author expounds the Christian doctrine (§§ 119-220).

Since the refutation of an-Nāshi' is a central issue in *Risāla fī tathbīt* and we know that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī in the year 925 copied an-Nāshi' 's *al-Kitāb al-awsaṭ* and presumably was mentally occupied with what an-Nāshi' did say in this book of his, we have good reason to believe that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī wrote *Risāla fī tathbīt* in 923 or soon thereafter at the age of a little more than thirty and many years before most of his other works appeared.

1.4.2 Philosophical terms and stylistic expressions

The discrepancies between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī with regard to philosophical terms and stylistic expressions could well be explained, if we assume that Yaḥyā wrote the treatise in 923, giving a period of about seventeen years between the composition of this treatise and *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, which was written in Rajab 328 / April-May 940¹⁷⁶ and is the earliest dated work by Yaḥyā.¹⁷⁷ In a span of seventeen years, i.e. from the age of about thirty till about forty-seven, it is quite conceivable that Yaḥyā developed his literary style and his use of philosophical terminology, the more so since during the earlier phase of his life he was less productive as an author and presumably less fixed in his style, his use of words and ideas, than he was to become in the later very productive phase of his life.¹⁷⁸

1.4.2.1 عَيْن

The radical discrepancy with regard to the term عَيْن¹⁷⁹ should be taken

¹⁷⁵ See especially *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 20, 41-42, and 53-54.

¹⁷⁶ Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, § 2.

¹⁷⁷ It is true that the very short treatise *Jawāb mas'ala waradat min ar-Rayy* (cf. Endress, *Works*, 70) dates as far back as Dhū l-Qa'da 301/May-June 914, but, for one thing, it is rather short to be considered for our purpose, and for another, an indication of decade may be missing in the date (cf. Samir's suggestion to read 341/953 instead of 301/914 in his *Le traité de l'unité*, 51, no. 72).

¹⁷⁸ Perhaps one should also keep in mind that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī was an industrious copyist (see p. 20 above), a preoccupation which certainly gave him the opportunity to learn a variety of ideas and styles which may have exerted an influence on him.

seriously. If we want to maintain the hypothesis, we ought to be able to explain why Yahyā stopped using the term عَيْن in a philosophical sense.

We know that Yahyā ibn 'Adī used and even copied the archetype of Ishāq ibn Hunayn's translation of Aristotle's *Categoriae*.¹⁸⁰ In Ishāq's translation the word جوهر was substituted, as a rendering of οὐσία, for the word عَيْن in 'Abdallāh ibn al-Muqaffa's earlier translation of *Categoriae*.¹⁸¹ If Yahyā did compose *Risāla fī tathbīt* in the year 923 or thereabouts, this seems to imply that during this period he was still unfamiliar with the terminological usage of Ishāq's translation, or, at least, that he did not yet approve of this terminological change from عَيْن to جوهر.

Without further proofs, it remains unclear why Yahyā should have made such a radical change with regard to عَيْن - from using it frequently in an early treatise to not using it at all in his later treatises. Perhaps it should be observed, though, that Yahyā uses جوهر in an ambiguous way not totally unlike the use of عَيْن in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.¹⁸² In arguing that the جوهر of Christ is one and single although composed of the جوهر of divinity and the جوهر of humanity, Yahyā draws the analogy of man being one single substance although composed of the animal (الحي) which is a substance, the rational (الناطق) which is a substance, and the mortal (المائت) which is a substance.¹⁸³ In another place, he says that Christ's جوهر, or substance, consists of the Eternal Son and the reality of man, and consequently is one single substance drawn from two substances.¹⁸⁴

1.4.2.2 ماهية

The term ماهية is much more frequently used in *Risāla fī tathbīt* than elsewhere in Yahyā's work,¹⁸⁵ but the very fact that the term is also used in the indisputably genuine works of Yahyā should warn us against taking this discrepancy too seriously, especially if the treatise was written many years before the other works.

1.4.2.3 من البين

As for the expression من البين,¹⁸⁶ one has to assume, in order to

179 See pp. 26-27 above.

180 Badawi, *Manṭiq Aristū* 1, 76/7-8; Georr, *Les Catégories*, 358/9-10. Cf. Endress, *Works*, 32 (no. 2.11).

181 See p. 27 above.

182 See p. 27 above.

183 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 20/1-3 (cf. also 42/13-17).

184 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 26/10-11.

185 See p. 27 above.

accept the attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, either that by chance Yaḥyā did not use the expression in this particular treatise, or, that during the seventeen-year span he simply adopted it and started using it to the extent that it almost became a mannerism. It should be noted, however, that there are other treatises by Yaḥyā where this expression does not occur either.¹⁸⁷

1.4.3 Doctrinal differences

I will now turn to the doctrinal differences between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī with regard to the triads of divine attributes and divine Unity. The question is whether these differences may be explained by the hypothesis of the treatise being an early piece of work by Yaḥyā.

1.4.5.1 The triads of divine attributes

We have already noticed¹⁸⁸ that the triad in *Risāla fī tathbīt* (وجود - حياة - نطق) does not occur in the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, where instead two other triads may be found (جود - حكمة - عقل). In the introduction to his edition of Yaḥyā's treatise on the unity, Khalil Samir¹⁸⁹ takes the view that Yaḥyā would have used the former of his two triads in his earlier treatises, in *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, which was written in 940, and those written up to about 965, while the other triad predominates in his later treatises, dating from about 969.

If a doctrinal development with regard to the two triads is already recognized in the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, it would not be surprising to find an even earlier phase in this doctrinal development in a treatise written about seventeen years before the first instance of the جود - حكمة - قدرة triad in *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*. We have positive evidence for such an assumption, if we consider the origins of these triads. While Samir hints at an Aristotelian background for the عقل - عاقل - حكمة triad,¹⁹⁰ he traces the origins of the حكمة - قدرة - جود triad to the Neoplatonist philosopher Proclus (d. 485).¹⁹¹ The corresponding

¹⁸⁶ See p. 28 above.

¹⁸⁷ E.g. Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī qawlinā tajassada*; Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Qawl fī ikhtilāf*; Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tamthīl an-Naṣārā*; Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalaṭ al-Kindī*; Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tahdhīb al-akhlāq*, to mention but a few examples. In the case of *Tahdhīb al-akhlāq*, though, the absence of من البين may be explained by the fact that we are here dealing with an ethical treatise, while the expression is more likely to be met with in argumentative texts.

¹⁸⁸ See pp. 28-29 above.

¹⁸⁹ Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 129.

¹⁹⁰ Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 129.

Neoplatonic triad of Proclus is ἀγαθότης - γνῶσις - δύναμις.¹⁹² But and this is significant - this is not the only triad used by Proclus. There is also the triad οὐσία - ζωή - νοῦς,¹⁹³ which corresponds perfectly to the triad of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

If Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī was aware of and even used one of Proclus' triads, it is far from unlikely that he was aware of and used Proclus' other triads, in an earlier phase of his doctrinal development. Whether Yaḥyā read Proclus himself in an Arabic translation¹⁹⁴ or knew of his doctrines indirectly does not affect the plausibility of the argument.

1.4.3.2 The doctrine of divine Unity

As for the different categories of "one", we have already observed that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's enumeration of at least six categories is a more detailed and elaborate enumeration than the one we find in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.¹⁹⁵ Since the three categories of this treatise, namely "one" in genus (جنس), "one" in species (نوع) and "one" in individuals (أشخاص),¹⁹⁶ also occur in Yaḥyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*¹⁹⁷ and in his *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*,¹⁹⁸ the addition of the other categories¹⁹⁹ may well be interpreted as a doctrinal development and refinement in relation to the more simple enumeration of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. While there are other authors among Yaḥyā's contemporaries and successors with even more elaborate lists of categories of "one",²⁰⁰ I do not know of any longer list in Christian Arabic literature prior to Yaḥyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd* than the one in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.²⁰¹

191 Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 127-129.

192 Proclus, *In Timaeum*, 118 E; Proclus, *Institutio Theologica*, 106/31-32 (prop. 121). Cf. Wolfson, *Kalām*, 124.

193 Proclus, *In Platonis Theologiam* 4:1 (ed. Saffrey-Westerink, IV, 7/2; ed. Portus, 180); Proclus, *Institutio Theologica*, 90 (prop. 101), *passim*. Cf. Wolfson, *Kalām*, 124.

194 For the Arabic Procliana, cf. Endress, *Proclus Arabus*, 13-30.

195 See pp. 29-31 above.

196 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 59-62, 98-101.

197 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawḥīd*, §§ 149-176.

198 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalat al-Kindī*, 12/4ff.

199 Cf. pp. 29-31 above.

200 For instance Abū Sulaymān as-Sijistānī speaks of at least eight different categories, according to at-Tawḥīdī, *al-Muqābasāt*, 315-319, *passim* (cf. the translation in Kraemer, *Philosophy*, 179-180; and Ibn at-Tayyib provides us with a list of twelve categories in a passage quoted by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl in his *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* (this passage is printed in Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 145-146, though the sixth category - one according to what is continuous/متصل is missing due to a printing error. Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 171.

201 An early instance of the categories genus, species and number appears in Abū Rā'īta, *ar-Risāla al-ūlā*, 5/6-7.

Turning to the question of the way in which the Creator may be said to be one, we have to establish whether the difference between the statement in *Risāla fī tathbīt* - that the Creator is one in species²⁰² - and the statement in Yahyā's *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd* - that the Creator is one in definition²⁰³ is too great to be explained in terms of a doctrinal development, or if there is a common element in the two statements.

If we look at the examples given by Yahyā in his treatise on the unity of what may be said to be one in species²⁰⁴ and what may be said to be one in definition,²⁰⁵ we find that they are identical in both cases: man (انسان). Could this be a common element between the two categories of one as Yahyā conceives of them? Is there an indication that the two categories actually mean the same thing? If so, the difference between the statement in *Risāla fī tathbīt* - that the Creator is one in species - and Yahyā's doctrine - that God is one in definition - could be reduced to a mere choice of words, readily explained by the span of seventeen years of our hypothesis. An analysis of the use of انسان in the two instances, though, reveals a fundamental difference. When Yahyā cites انسان as an example of what is one in definition (واحد بالحد),²⁰⁶ what he has in mind is the definition of man as "living, rational, mortal" (حي - ناطق - مائت). When he cites انسان as an example of what is one in species, Yahyā has something quite different in mind, namely, a plurality of subjects.

In Yahyā's treatise on the unity, the author does not explicitly state what he intends by using انسان as an example of this category of one.²⁰⁷ But elsewhere Yahyā speaks of what is "one in definition, many in subject", (واحد في الحد كثير في الموضوع), using انسان as an example: the definition of man is one, but the subjects are many (e.g. "Zayd - 'Abdallāh - Khālid").²⁰⁸ According to Yahyā, God is not one in this sense, since he is one in subject, and not many.²⁰⁹

It is obvious that, for Yahyā, one in the sense of "one in definition, many in subject" is identical with one in the sense of "one in species". A good Aristotelian, as Yahyā ibn 'Adī in many ways was,²¹⁰ he was surely

²⁰² E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168.

²⁰³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 267-268.

²⁰⁴ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, § 150.

²⁰⁵ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, § 161.

²⁰⁶ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 160-161.

²⁰⁷ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, § 150.

²⁰⁸ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*, 10/3-6; Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Tabyīn ghalāṭ al-Kindī*, 13/8-11.

²⁰⁹ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī t-tawhīd*, §§ 278-280, 309.

²¹⁰ Yahyā ibn 'Adī's categories of "one", for instance, may be traced back to *Metaphysica*, *Topica* and *Physica*. Cf. Samir, *Le traité de l'unité*, 196-197 (notes); Kraemer, *Philosophy*, 181-184; and Wolfson, *Kalām*, 327-330.

acquainted with the Stagirite's identification of these two categories of one in *Metaphysica*.²¹¹

Despite the fact that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī uses انسان as an example both of one in the sense of "one in definition" as well as of one in the sense of "one in species" = "one in definition, many in subject", there is, nevertheless, a fundamental difference of emphasis between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā with regard to the doctrine of divine unity. The doctrine of *Risāla fī tathbīt* - that the Creator is one in species - answers the question how the three hypostases may be one God, while Yaḥyā's statement - that God is one in definition - rather answers the question how the one God may be three hypostases.²¹²

On the whole, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's reasoning with regard to the different categories of one and which of these are applicable to divine unity is more mature, more subtle and less susceptible to criticism than the doctrine of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. The two models of reasoning, though synchronically incompatible with one another, may nevertheless have come from one and the same author, if a diachronic doctrinal development on the part of the author is assumed, in accordance with the hypothesis that the treatise is an early piece of work by Yaḥyā, written in his youth before he had developed his mature doctrinal position.

1.4.3.3 The dialectics of propositions and terms

It goes without saying that the dialectics of propositions and terms, which we have found to be a characteristic trait of the genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī and which cannot be found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*,²¹³ may also be explained by the hypothesis.

1.5 Summary

I will now summarize the investigation of the pros and cons of an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.

First,²¹⁴ I took into consideration some positive indications for an attribution to Yaḥyā which might corroborate the incontestable fact that the treatise is attributed to Yaḥyā in the manuscript tradition. The problem of the three positive arguments which I considered - i.e. the image of a ship, the three grades of existence, and the formula على التقريب والتمثيل - is the difficulty of judging whether these concepts and terms really are typical of Yaḥyā, or would prove fairly common if we had a more extensive

²¹¹ Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, 1016a/32-35; 1016b/31-33. Cf. Wolfson, *Kalām*, 330.

²¹² Cf. Wolfson, *Kalām*, 330.

²¹³ See pp. 31-32 above.

²¹⁴ See pp. 21-25 above.

knowledge of Christian Arabic literature than is possible today.

Secondly,²¹⁵ I presented some arguments against an attribution to Yaḥyā. Besides the doubt expressed in the marginal note, I collected some conspicuous differences between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī with regard to philosophical terms and stylistic expressions (من البين and ماهية, عين) and doctrinal differences (the triads of divine attributes, the doctrine of divine unity, and the dialectics of propositions and terms). The fundamental differences and disagreements found here could be regarded as sufficiently conclusive to convince us that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī can hardly be the author of the treatise.

Nevertheless, I have finally²¹⁶ tried to defend the authorship of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, starting from the hypothesis that the treatise was written very early in Yaḥyā's life, long before the appearance of his mature works. I would not have put forward such a bold (and perhaps unnecessary) hypothesis, if I had had no positive indications whatsoever for doing so. The idea struck me when I read aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl's introduction to his refutation of an-Nāshī' al-Akbar's *al-Kitāb al-awsaṭ*.²¹⁷ The fact that Yaḥyā at an early age in 923 was busy copying an-Nāshī's work and was presumably preoccupied with the Mu'tazilite's thought, together with the fact that a certain aspect of an-Nāshī's thought is refuted in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, though an-Nāshī's name never occurs elsewhere in Yaḥyā's works - a cause of wonder even in aṣ-Ṣafī's above-mentioned introduction - gave me the courage to test the hypothesis.

Most successfully explained by the hypothesis are those differences which may be interpreted in terms of a development from simplicity to complexity (e.g. the lists of categories of "one") or as an additional phase in an already recognizable development in Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's thought (e.g. the triads of divine attributes). On the other hand such a difference as that observed in connection with the philosophical term عين needs further explanations.

The merit - or fault - of the hypothesis is to neutralize the arguments against Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. So far it is still impossible to decide the question of authorship. In order to get any further, we have to take into consideration the results an investigation of the attribution to al-Kaskarī in the marginal note may yield.

²¹⁵ See pp. 25-33 above.

²¹⁶ See pp. 33-40 above.

²¹⁷ See p. 34 above.

2 al-Kaskarī

2.1 The Nestorian diocese of Kashkar and candidates for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt* possible

Since the adjectival name (*nisba*) - al-Kaskarī - of the person to whom the marginal note in MS A²¹⁸ attributes *Risāla fī tathbīt* suggests a descentance from, or some other close relation to, the town or district of Kashkar, we have to consider this locality and the persons connected with it who are possible as authors of the treatise.

2.1.1 The Nestorian diocese of Kashkar

The town of Kashkar,²¹⁹ called "Kaskar" by the Arabs, was situated on the eastern shore of the Tigris river, facing al-Wāsiṭ which town al-Hajjāj (d. 713) founded midway between Kūfa and Baṣra.²²⁰

Kashkar was probably the most ancient diocese of the region. This may be inferred from the fact that the bishop of Kashkar was the most important bishop after the Catholicos, or Patriarch, of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, later of Baghdad, and that he was responsible for the patriarchal see in times of vacancy.²²¹

The main sources for our knowledge of the history of the Nestorian diocese of Kashkar and its bishops, are, for the earlier period, the *Synodicon orientale*²²² and the Arabic *Chronicle of Se'ert*,²²³ and for the earlier as well as the later periods, the Arabic chronicles²²⁴ of Mārī ibn Sulaymān (about 1150),²²⁵ 'Amr ibn Mattā (about 1350),²²⁶ and Ṣalībā ibn

²¹⁸ See *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 2 (note 4).

²¹⁹ For the town and diocese of Kashkar, cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 151-187, with further references.

²²⁰ For the location of Kashkar, cf. Streck, *Wāsiṭ*, 848.

²²¹ According to the statutes of the council of Mār Isaac in 410 A.D. (Canon 21): *Synodicon orientale*, 33/14-15 (272, transl.). Cf. also *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 1/3-5.

²²² *Synodicon orientale* covers the period from the council of 410 till about 775-790 during which years the catholicos Timothy I (780-823) collected the material. Cf. Sachau, *Ausbreitung*, 10.

²²³ The parts which are extant cover the period from the third century to the seventh century. For the author of the chronicle, cf. Nautin, *L'auteur, passim*.

²²⁴ I.e. the parts dealing with the history of the catholicos in *Kitāb al-majdal* and *Asfār al-asrār* (which have been edited by Henricus Gismondi).

²²⁵ Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 200-202. In Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 298-300 (= ed. Riedel, 650-651/transl. 680-682), Mārī ibn Sulaymān's *Kitāb al-majdal* has incorrectly been attributed to 'Amr ibn Mattā, though Khalil Samir in his edition of Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 298 (note 2), seems to be unaware of this.

²²⁶ Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 216-218. 'Amr ibn Mattā's *Kitāb al-majdal* is dependent on Mārī ibn Sulaymān's work of the same title, but it contains a lot of new materials.

Yūḥannā (after 1350).²²⁷

In addition to these sources, the Syriac so-called *Liber castitatis* by Ishō'dnaḥ of Baṣra (9th cent.)²²⁸ and the likewise Syriac so-called *Liber superiorum* by Thomas of Marga (9th cent.)²²⁹ give important information on monks and saints connected with Kashkar.

2.1.2 The possible candidates for the authorship of the treatise

In order to find plausible candidates for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, I have consulted the above-mentioned sources in search of persons connected with Kashkar and mentioned as authors or scholars. Since persons who lived earlier than the ninth century can hardly be considered as authors of the treatise, the information has been drawn mainly from *Kitāb al-majdal* of Mārī ibn Sulaymān and his "continuator".²³⁰ Remarkably few names are worth mentioning.

2.1.2.1 Bābai of Kashkar (d. 853)²³¹

As bishop of Kashkar, he was elected catholicos because of his knowledge and intelligence, but died of an abdominal disease.

2.1.2.2 Michael of al-Ahwāz (d. 853)²³²

Originally from Kashkar, he was also one of the several bishops who were elected catholicos in 853. Like the preceding Bābai of Kashkar, he is said to have been knowledgeable and intelligent.

2.1.2.3 Israel of Kashkar (d.872)²³³

Bishop of Kashkar, he was elected catholicos after Sergius in 872, but was subsequently killed by the followers of his rival Enosh. Famous for his

²²⁷ Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 217-218. Ṣalībā ibn Yūḥannā's *Asfār al-asrār* is almost nothing but a plagiarism in relation to 'Amr ibn Mattā's *Kitāb al-majdal*, though the title and the division into chapters have been changed.

²²⁸ Cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 234; and Wright, *A short history*, 195. *Liber castitatis* was edited by J.-B. Chabot in 1896.

²²⁹ Cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 233-234; and Wright, *A short history*, 219-220. *Liber superiorum* was edited by E. A. Wallis Budge in 1893.

²³⁰ Cf. notes 225-227 above.

²³¹ *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 78/7-9; 2, 72/7-8.

²³² *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 78/13-14.

²³³ *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 81/10-20; 2, 73/10, 73/18-74/8.

knowledge and his ability as a polemicist, he has been confused with his namesake who lived a century later. Since he is a serious candidate for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, I will presently deal with him more thoroughly.²³⁴

2.1.2.4 Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)²³⁵

Originally from Karkh Jiddān, this Israel later became bishop of Kashkar. At the age of 90, he was elected catholicos, but less than four months later he died. He was known for his learning, his piety, and his ability to foresee the future. As a serious candidate for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, he will be considered more thoroughly further on.²³⁶

2.1.2.5 Elia of Kashkar (d. 986 or 987)²³⁷

As bishop of Kashkar, Elia came to al-Madā'in (i.e. Seleucia-Ctesiphon) in order to guard the patriarchal see when the catholicos 'Abdīshū' had passed away on the 2nd of June 986. He took care of everything very well and was elected catholicos, but died before he was consecrated. Instead of him, Mārī was elected and consecrated catholicos on the 10th of April 987. From the dates given, it may be inferred that Elia of Kashkar died sometime between the 2nd of June 986 and the 10th of April 987.

If this Elia of Kashkar is identical with the ʿIliyyā al-Kashkarānī mentioned by Mārī ibn Sulaymān,²³⁸ an identity which Anton Baumstark²³⁹ seems to take for granted, he was the author of a commentary on the orations of Gregory of Nazianzus (d. about 390).²⁴⁰

A further identification with Elia bar Kanūsh²⁴¹ makes him the author of benedictions and orations as well as of a treatise on the use of the Psalms and a treatise on the sacraments of the Church.²⁴²

Unfortunately, none of these writings has come down to us, which makes it difficult to evaluate the likelihood of Elia of Kashkar being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. Nevertheless, I do not consider him a serious candidate. For one thing, there is no evidence that he ever wrote anything in

²³⁴ See pp. 48-58 below.

²³⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16-99/16; 2, 91/7-93/6.

²³⁶ See pp. 58-61 below.

²³⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 106/9-107/1; 2, 94/6-9. Cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 240.

²³⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 20/12.

²³⁹ Baumstark, *GSL*, 240.

²⁴⁰ For Gregory of Nazianzus, cf. Altaner, *Patrologie*, 298-303, 609-610 (for the orations, especially p. 300); and Quasten, *Patrology* 3, 236-254.

²⁴¹ Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 262 (note 1), advocates this identity. Cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 240.

²⁴² According to 'Abdīshū's *Catalogue*, chap. 180, as quoted in Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 262 (English transl. in Badger, *Nestorians* 2, 378). Cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 240.

Arabic. For another, if Elia of Kashkar were the author of the treatise, one would have expected to find some traces of his acquaintance with Gregory of Nazianzus, whose orations he is supposed to have annotated. On the contrary, I have not found any obvious parallels between the Trinitarian doctrine of *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the Trinitarian doctrine of the Cappadocian Fathers, i.e. parallels which are more conspicuous than might be expected in any medieval treatise on the Trinity.

2.1.2.6 Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī (10th cent.)

Very little is known about the physician Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī.²⁴³ Apart from a reference in the work of Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a,²⁴⁴ according to which Ya'qūb was the director of a hospital (بيمارستان), we have to rely on his own compendium in medicine - *Kunnāsh fī ṭ-ṭibb* - for biographical information.²⁴⁵ Here we learn²⁴⁶ that he had studied logic for Thābit ibn Qurra,²⁴⁷ and that he worked in the hospital of the mother of the caliph al-Muqtadir, the hospital of Badr, and the hospital of Šā'id.²⁴⁸

Whether this Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī is to be identified with the Ya'qūb ibn Zakariyā' al-Kashkarī²⁴⁹ whom al-Mas'ūdī²⁵⁰ mentions as the author of a book on history, we do not know.²⁵¹

When comparing Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī's *Kunnāsh fī ṭ-ṭibb* with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, we cannot expect to find any correspondences with regard to subject-matter. The genres of the two works are too different for that. Yet, on the level of style and the choice of words and expressions it is possible to detect parallels between the two works.²⁵² But since we do not have any positive evidence of theological activity on the part of Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī -

²⁴³ Cf. Sezgin, *GAS* 3, 309; and Sezgin's introduction (without pagination) to the facsimile edition of *Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī, Kunnāsh*.

²⁴⁴ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 160/23.

²⁴⁵ Cf. note 243 above.

²⁴⁶ Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī, *Kunnāsh*, fol. 72r/16.

²⁴⁷ For Thābit ibn Qurra, cf. an-Nadīm, *Fihris*, 272/5-18 (Dodge 2, 647-648); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 215-218; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 115-122; and Peters, *Aristotle and the Arabs*, 60, note 13 (with further references).

²⁴⁸ Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī, *Kunnāsh*, fol. 125r/12-13.

²⁴⁹ Cf. *al-Mashriq* 12 (1909), 484; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 155 (no. 4); and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179-180.

²⁵⁰ al-Mas'ūdī, *Tanbih*, 155/2-5.

²⁵¹ Cf. Sezgin, *Introduction*.

²⁵² E.g. *أنا ترى* in Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī, *Kunnāsh*, fol. 123v/10 (cf. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 134, 210, and 218); and *كذلك* on fol. 124v/6 (cf. e.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 22, 136) *الدليل* *أن* *على ذلك* and similar expressions on foll. 124r/10, 124v/4, 130v/16-17, 131r/5, and 148v/16 (cf. e.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, 151, 159, and 168).

we do not even know anything about his religion - it is impossible to decide whether he may be the author of the treatise or not. Only if someone else turns out to be the author, can Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī be definitely excluded. For the time being the question must be left open.

2.1.2.7 Abū l-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā (10th cent.)

A pupil of Sinān ibn Thābit,²⁵³ Abū l-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā²⁵⁴ was a physician in the service of Sayf ad-Dawla (d. 967).²⁵⁵ When 'Adā him *al-Bīmāristān al-'Aḍudī*,²⁵⁶ he employed Abū l-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā. Furthermore, we know that he had a brother who was a monk,²⁵⁷ and that he is supposed to have been garrulous, or fond of disputing, and enjoyed embarrassing the physicians with interrogations and assaults.²⁵⁸

As to his literary activity, Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a²⁵⁹ and al-Qifṭī²⁶⁰ mention a compendium (كناش) known as *al-Hāwī*, as well as another compendium "in the name of him to whom he wrote it".

Could this second compendium be identified with *Risāla fī tathbīt*? The words "in the name of him to whom he wrote it"²⁶¹ seem to suggest that the compendium in question had been associated with the name of the person who commissioned the work. This would fit in fairly well with *Risāla fī tathbīt* which the author introduces by addressing a person who is supposed to have asked him to write it.²⁶² Since the treatise has been connected with the name of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, the possibility that Ibn Kashkarāyā is the author and that he wrote it for Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī readily suggests itself. This would explain why the treatise has found its place among the genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī. Further, the designation *kunnāsh*, though not employed in the work, might well do as a designation of *Risāla fī tathbīt* which, with its many short doxographical passages, gives the impression of being an

²⁵³ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 146/10, 236/13, 238/13, 310/16-17; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/6. For Sinān ibn Thābit, cf. an-Nadīm, *Fihris*, 302/20-23 (Dodge 2, 709); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 220/29-224/22; and al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 190/11-195/ult.

²⁵⁴ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/8-15; and al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/5-12. Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 132; *BAC* 4:1 (1980), 35 (no. 90); and Cheikho-Hechaïmé, *Les savants*, 83 (no. 62). It is not likely that he should be identified with Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī (cf. Sezgin, *Introduction*).

²⁵⁵ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/9; and al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/9.

²⁵⁶ Cf. Meyerhof, *Von Alexandrien nach Baghdad*, 424-425.

²⁵⁷ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/11-12; and al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/11.

²⁵⁸ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/11; and al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/10.

²⁵⁹ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/14-15.

²⁶⁰ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/10.

²⁶¹ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/19; and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn I*, 238/15 (إليه instead of له).

²⁶² *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 4-5.

epitome, a collection, or a compendium.²⁶³

Though this hypothesis is attractive at first sight, several arguments may be raised against it on second thoughts. First, there is nothing in the sources to prove that Ibn Kashkarāyā was a philosopher or a theologian, besides being a physician.²⁶⁴ To be sure, many philosophers in the tenth century earned their living by working as physicians,²⁶⁵ but in the case of Ibn Kashkarāyā nothing of this sort is reported.²⁶⁶ In addition to this, both Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a²⁶⁷ and al-Qifṭī²⁶⁸ seem to take it for granted that the second compendium is a medical work as well as the first. If the two works were of different genres, I think this would have been registered by Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a and al-Qifṭī.²⁶⁹

Secondly, the alleged aetiology of *Risāla fī tathbīt* as presented by the author himself²⁷⁰ - i.e. that the treatise was written at someone else's request - is probably not to be regarded as the true reason for its composition. On the contrary, the many close parallels to this introduction in other Christian Arabic and Syriac treatises²⁷¹ seem to indicate that we are dealing here with a literary convention, a stylistic device employed in order to give an excuse (عُذْر) ²⁷² for writing the work. Even if the treatise were written at someone's request, it is difficult to believe that the expert philosopher and theologian Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī should have asked the physician Ibn Kashkarāyā for a treatise explaining the oneness and threeness of God.

263 The word كُنَاش is related to the Syriac word כְּנָשָׁא and usually refers to a collection of prayers in West Syrian in Melchite terminological usage (cf. Graf, *Verzeichnis*, 98).

264 Or, are we supposed to interpret the following words of Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 238/11, as indicating that he was a *mutakallim*:

وكان أبو الحسين بن كشرايا كثير الكلام
يحب أن يخجل الأطباء بالمسألة والتجهم

(cf. al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/10-11)?

265 E. g. Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn (d. 910) and 'Isā ibn Zur'a (d. 1008) only to mention two.

266 Cf. note 264 above though. A list of Christian (Nestorian) physicians from whom only medical works have come down to us is given by Graf, *GCAL* 2, 131-132, where Abū I-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā is mentioned.

267 Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* I, 238/14-15.

268 al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 403/10.

269 It should be remembered, though, that the two bio-bibliographical compilers themselves may have lacked more precise information.

270 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 4-7.

271 E.g. Nonnus of Nisibis, *Traité apologétique*, 1*/1-10 (cf. Albert van Roey's introduction, 44-45); Abū Rā'iṭa, *ar-Risāla al-ūlā*, § 2; Abū Rā'iṭa, *Fī ithbāt dīn an-naṣrāniyya*, § 1 (cf. Griffith, *Abū Rā'iṭa*, 167); Ibn Zur'a, *Maqāla 'an at-tathlīth*, 68/9-14; and Paul of Antioch, *Risāla ilā l-muslimīn*, § 3.

272 See *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 8.

2.1.2.8 Summary

Of the seven persons connected in some way with Kashkar and at first sight appearing to be possible candidates for the authorship of *Risāla fi tathbīt*, two may safely be dismissed from the list (viz. Bābai of Kashkar and Michael of al-Ahwāz). Three others (viz. Elia of Kashkar, Ya'qūb al-Kashkarī, and Abū l-Ḥusayn ibn Kashkarāyā) are more interesting, but after closer examination, they too may be dismissed for the time being.

The two remaining candidates, both called Israel of Kashkar but separated in time by a century, constitute a more difficult case and call for special attention.

2.2 Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

The main sources for our knowledge of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)²⁷³ are the patriarchal history in the Nestorian encyclopaedic work *Kitāb al-majdal*²⁷⁴ and a section in a Florentine manuscript which relates a dialogue between Israel and Aḥmad ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī, the pupil of the philosopher al-Kindī.

2.2.1 The testimony of *Kitāb al-majdal*

Most of the information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in *Kitāb al-majdal*²⁷⁵ is found under the heading of Enosh, the forty-eighth Nestorian catholicos according to the list of Elia of Damascus.²⁷⁶ But already in connection with the preceding catholicos, Sergius,²⁷⁷ the name of Israel occurs. Here it is stated that Sergius appointed "Israel, the interpreter (المفسر)" bishop of Kashkar.²⁷⁸ From this comment, two pieces of information may be gained.

First, we may fix the *terminus post quem* of Israel's appointment as bishop of Kashkar to the 21 of Tammūz 1171 according to the Greeks (= 21 July 860 A.D.), since this is the date when Sergius became catholicos.²⁷⁹

²⁷³ See Le Quien, *Oriens christianus* 2, 1132, 1166; Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 512-513; Steinschneider, *Polemische*, 125-126 (no. 106a.); Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156; and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 178-179. This Israel is commemorated as a saint in Ibn al-Bahlūl, *Kitāb ad-dalā'il*, 217/6. Cf. Fiey, *Calendrier syriaque orientale* (in print).

²⁷⁴ Cf. pp. 42-43 (notes 225-227) above.

²⁷⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/10-2; 2, 73/18-74/8.

²⁷⁶ Elia of Damascus, MS *Vat. ar.* 157, fol. 82r/14; Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 269, 270 (no. 48). Cf. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus* 2, 1132.

²⁷⁷ Elia of Damascus, MS *Vat. ar.* 157, fol. 82r/14; Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 269, 270 (no. 47). Cf. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus* 2, 1131-1132.

²⁷⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/10.

²⁷⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 72/20-73/10.

Secondly, the epithet of interpreter given to Israel is the only piece of information which perhaps reveals something of his occupation before becoming a bishop. Though the word *المفسر* is ambiguous, since it may mean both "interpreter" in the sense of someone who comments on a text (i.e. a commentator), and "interpreter" in the sense of someone who translates a text from one language into another (i.e. a translator),²⁸⁰ it nevertheless indicates that Israel was a scholar and a learned monk - perhaps connected with one of the two schools at Kashkar.²⁸¹

This indication of Israel being a scholar and a learned monk is corroborated in the subsequent account of the rivalry between Israel and Enosh for the patriarchal see upon the death of Sergius.²⁸² Here it is stated²⁸³ that Israel was worthy of being elected *catholicos*, because of his knowledge (*علم*) and his excellence (*فضل*), and it is further added²⁸⁴ that he was intelligent (*فهم*) and an expert in debate (*عالم بالجدل*).

When Israel had been elected *catholicos* and thus pleased the multitude,²⁸⁵ Enosh, the metropolitan of Mosul, showed up and claimed the leadership of the Church for himself.²⁸⁶ Since Enosh also had good qualities, some people sided with him,²⁸⁷ and conflict arose between the two and their supporters. Quarrels took place and injuries were inflicted.²⁸⁸ Common people got the upper hand of the leaders,²⁸⁹ and people struck one another and ripped clothes apart.²⁹⁰ Both parties even went so far as to contact the political authorities for assistance,²⁹¹ though the authorities already had trouble with the Zanj revolt under the leadership of 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Baṣrī.²⁹² The ruler in Baghdad tried to dissuade Israel,²⁹³ a measure which only aggravated the rivalry.

A fatal and dramatic climax was reached when Israel was about to

²⁸⁰ In this latter sense of translating, the verb *فسر* is, for instance, used about Elia of Damascus in MS Vat. ar. 157, fol. 2v/2:

هذا ما فسرّه اليا مطران دمشق من السريانية إلى العربية

Cf. also MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 151r/10, 12.

²⁸¹ Cf. Fiey, *Asyrie chrétienne* 3, 162 (with note 5 for references).

²⁸² *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/1-14.

²⁸³ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/12.

²⁸⁴ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/20-74/1.

²⁸⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 74/1.

²⁸⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/12-13; 2, 74/1-2.

²⁸⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/13-14; 2, 74/2.

²⁸⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/14.

²⁸⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/14.

²⁹⁰ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 74/3-4.

²⁹¹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/15.

²⁹² *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/15-16. For 'Alī al-Baṣrī, see Lewis, 'Alī b. M. az-Zanjī.

²⁹³ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/16-17.

officiate on one occasion.²⁹⁴ Having descended from the bema during the responsory, in order to begin the Holy Mass at the altar, Israel was approached by a follower of Enosh who extended his hand in the throng and violently squeezed the genitals of Israel without any fear of God.²⁹⁵ Israel fainted, and after a sickness of forty days he died and was buried in the monastery of Mār Pethion.²⁹⁶

2.2.2 The dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī (MS Florence *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 149v-156r)

Besides the patriarchal history in *Kitāb al-majdal*, the other source which gives us information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is the dialogue between Israel and Aḥmad ibn at-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī, pupil of the philosopher al-Kindī, which is found in MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 149v-155v.²⁹⁷ The text has been translated into English by Matti Moosa,²⁹⁸ though rather unsatisfactorily.²⁹⁹

2.2.2.1 Two questions raised by the title of the dialogue

The very title³⁰⁰ of the dialogue raises a couple of questions. First, who is the "Elia, metropolitan of Nisibis" who has reported on the session (مجلس)? As Matti Moosa³⁰¹ has correctly pointed out, the Elia mentioned here is not the famous Elia of Nisibis (d. 1046),³⁰² which would have been chronologically impossible. In the lines following the title, fortunately, the identity of the person in question is more accurately expressed as "Elia, metropolitan of the West (المغرب), who was called 'Alī ibn 'Ubayd ibn Dāwūd before he became a monk",³⁰³ i.e. Elia of Damascus,³⁰⁴ the bishop

²⁹⁴ "A day on which the people had agreed" (*Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 74/4-5).

²⁹⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/17-19; 2, 74/4-7.

²⁹⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/19-20; 2, 74/7-8. For this monastery, cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 52; and Allard, *Les chrétiens*, 378.

²⁹⁷ For a description of this manuscript, see Assemani, *Florence*, 113-115 (no. LXIII); and Moosa, *A new source*, passim (especially pp. 19-20).

²⁹⁸ Moosa, *A new source*, 22-24.

²⁹⁹ I have prepared an edition of the text and a new translation.

³⁰⁰ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 149v/9-10:

مجلس ذكر ايليا مطران نصيبين حضرة اسرائيل العسكري

³⁰¹ Moosa, *A new source*, 20.

³⁰² For Elia of Nisibis, cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 177-189, 478; and Samir, *ISCH* 3 (1977), 257-284. Cf. p. 21 (note 56) above.

³⁰³ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 149v/11-12.

³⁰⁴ For Elia of Damascus, cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 132-135; and pp. 92-96 below.

of Jerusalem who became metropolitan of Damascus in the middle of July 893 A.D.³⁰⁵ It is obvious that Elia of Damascus was confused with the more famous Elia of Nisibis by later Christian Arabic authors and copyists.³⁰⁶

Secondly, what is the part played by Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), according to the title? Matti Moosa³⁰⁷ has translated the word *حضره* in the sense that the session, or assembly, was "attended by (Israel)". But since Israel, in fact, is the main character and hero of the dialogue, it appears to me to be an understatement to say that Israel attended the session. Consequently, I prefer to interpret the word *حضره* as an adverbial accusative referring to the verb *ذكر* and meaning "in the presence of", i.e. "on behalf of", or "by order of", Israel of Kashkar.³⁰⁸ This interpretation, I think, is more consistent with the context. Moreover, the interpretation I have proposed suggests a closer connection between the actual views and intentions of Israel of Kashkar, on the one hand, and the text as written by Elia of Damascus, on the other, than would otherwise have been the case. This means that, though the text is written by Elia of Damascus, the views expressed in it may be regarded as positively consistent with the intentions of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872).

2.2.2.2 A summary of the dialogue and its information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

Having discussed two fundamental questions raised by the title of the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī, I will now summarize the contents of the text and present the information about Israel which may be gathered from it.

The title is followed by an introduction³⁰⁹ which in its present form hardly belongs to the original text of Elia of Damascus,³¹⁰ but is probably the work of an editor. In the introduction, the scene is Baghdad at a meeting between Elia and al-Kindī. The philosopher has been informed of the arrival of Israel of Kashkar, and expresses his doubts about the report of Israel's alleged knowledge of religion and the sciences, maintaining as he does that three are one and one is three. When Elia has defended Israel and

³⁰⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 80/16-17.

³⁰⁶ The same confusion may be found in al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*. See Graf, *Schriftstellerverzeichnis*, 214/20, 215 (no. 25), 221-222 (note on no. 25).

³⁰⁷ Moosa, *A new source*, 22.

³⁰⁸ For this meaning of the word, see Simaika, *Catalogue* 2:1, 258 (no. 577 = MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Can.* 9): *بحضره*. Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 1, 582.

³⁰⁹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 149v/11-150v/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/5-33.

³¹⁰ Cf. the words with which the introduction begins: "A certain authority has told us about Elia...." (MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 149v/11).

guaranteed the soundness of his doctrine and the truth of his evidence, al-Kindī exhorts the foremost of his pupils, as-Sarakhsī, to go to Israel, in order to find out the extent of his knowledge.

After this introduction, which provides the reason for the dialogue, the actual account of Elia of Damascus starts.³¹¹ First, the external scene of the assembly is pictured.³¹² The whole event takes place in the monastery of Mār Pethion,³¹³ where the bishop Israel is seated together with metropolitans and bishops and other people who have come to greet him. After a while, as-Sarakhsī arrives together with a group of Jewish, Muslim, and Mu'tazilite polemicists. Having greeted the bishop, as-Sarakhsī takes his seat facing the bishop. Then follows the first of Elia's four eulogistic descriptions of Israel.³¹⁴

The actual dialogue between as-Sarakhsī and Israel is divided into four questions³¹⁵ asked by as-Sarakhsī and answered by Israel. The first topic to be dealt with concerns the appropriateness or inappropriateness of designating the bishop by means of a "father name", or *kunya* (Abū...).³¹⁶ Israel gives four reasons why it is inappropriate for as-Sarakhsī to address him by a *kunya*, whereupon follows the second eulogy of the bishop:

"When the bishop explained this, people gazed at him, because he explained what no one before him had explained so spontaneously and without effort. His excellence became manifest to them, and they and Aḥmad knew that he was capable of speculative reasoning (نظر) and had mastery over argumentation (كلام)."³¹⁷

This first section dealing with the *kunya*, is very important for our purpose, not because of what it says about the *kunya*, but because it seems to intimate that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) was ignorant of Arabic and had to depend on an interpreter. When as-Sarakhsī has asked Israel about his *kunya*, the bishop turns to his disciple, Ibrāhīm,³¹⁸ and says: "I do not

³¹¹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 150v/4ff.; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/34ff.

³¹² MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 150v/4-151r/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/34(first column)-22/13(second column).

³¹³ Cf. p. 50 (note 296) above.

³¹⁴ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 150v/14-151r/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/9(first column)-22/13(second column).

³¹⁵ Matti Moosa has only recognized three of them, viz. the first, the second, and the fourth, though the third is included in his translation (Moosa, *A new source*, 21).

³¹⁶ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 151r/4-152r/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/14(second column)-23/16(first column).

³¹⁷ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 151v/11-14; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/4-9(first column).

³¹⁸ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 151r/6; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/15ff.(second column). (Matti Moosa's translation here is not accurate.)

know the man, so I will address the answer to you in Syriac, in order for you to translate it (لتفسيره)³¹⁹ for him into Arabic."³²⁰ Matti Moosa³²¹ takes it for granted that Israel knew no Arabic, that he relied on an interpreter in his debate with as-Sarakhsī, and that he probably used a disciple as his interpreter at similar assemblies in Baghdad.

I think one should be careful not to jump to conclusions in this matter. Rather, in the light of what we know of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) from other sources, and in the light of the present dialogue, one has to reflect on the plausibility of Israel being ignorant of Arabic. Since we know that Israel was bishop of Kashkar³²² for several years and was finally elected catholicos in 872 A.D.³²³ because of his knowledge and his intelligence, and because he was an expert in debate³²⁴ - a fact which is also stressed throughout Elia's account of the dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī - the question inevitably presents itself whether it is at all conceivable that this individual should have been ignorant of Arabic. At least it seems to be extremely unlikely that this should have been the case.

If the designation of Israel as "the interpreter" (المفسر) which is found in *Kitāb al-majdal*³²⁵ may be taken in the sense of "translator", this is an additional argument in favour of Israel's knowledge of Arabic. But since the term, as has already been pointed out,³²⁶ may also be taken in the sense of "commentator", this argument remains inconclusive.

More important than the designation of "interpreter", is the context of Elia's account.³²⁷ From the four reasons given by Israel when explaining why it is inappropriate for as-Sarakhsī to address him as a bishop by means of a *kunya*, it is quite clear that as-Sarakhsī's desire to call Israel "the father of someone" is regarded as a grave insult to the celibate bishop. With this fact in mind, the bishop's reaction is certainly appropriate to the situation. Instead of addressing the offensive as-Sarakhsī, he turns to his disciple and says: "I do not know the man..."³²⁸ as if he were saying: "I will have nothing to do with this rude man, and I will not speak to him directly in

³¹⁹ Cf. the discussion of the word فسر on p. 49 (with note 280) above.

³²⁰ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 151r/8-10; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/19-20(second column).

³²¹ Moosa, *A new source*, 22 (note 12).

³²² I.e. the most important bishopric after the catholicos.

³²³ I.e. at a date when Mesopotamia had been under the dominion of the Arabs for more than two centuries.

³²⁴ Cf. p. 49 (with notes 283 and 284) above.

³²⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/10. Cf. p. 48 above, as well as p. 91 below.

³²⁶ Cf. p. 49 above.

³²⁷ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 151r/4ff.; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/14ff.(second column).

³²⁸ Cf. pp. 52-53 above.

his own tongue, but you will have to act as interpreter...".

Further, since it is a point in Israel's answer that he is a Syrian while as-Sarakhsī is an Arab and that the use of the *kunya* only applies to Arabs, it fits in well with the argument that Israel underlines his ethnic identity by speaking Syriac.

Consequently, the fact that Israel uses his disciple as an interpreter when as-Sarakhsī wants to know his *kunya*, by no means proves that Israel was ignorant of Arabic, but may very well be regarded as an *ad hoc* reaction to an insult. It should be noted that apart from this discussion about the *kunya*, the presence of the disciple and his function as an interpreter has no significance in the rest of the dialogue.³²⁹

Having dwelt upon the first of the four topics of the dialogue, I now turn to the second.³³⁰ When as-Sarakhsī has agreed to address Israel as "Bishop", he challenges Israel's Trinitarian doctrine by stating that if we add one to eight, it becomes nine. Israel, who sees through the cunning of as-Sarakhsī's challenge, answers in the negative. After some disorder among the people in the audience who now think that the bishop has lost his case, Israel raises his voice and states that the condition (حال) of eight does not undergo any change with regard to its essence by the alteration of number. No self-subsisting thing is altered in its essence by the change of number.³³¹

The bishop's intelligent answer astonishes the assembly, and Elia comes up with a third eulogistic description of Israel:

"It became evident to as-Sarakhsī and those who were with him, and to all those who had gathered for the session, that the bishop was proficient in speculative reasoning, perfect in defending the faith, true in his notions of inferential argument, a master of polemics, and truly able in logic."³³²

The third topic³³³ interrupts the second and fourth both of which deal

329 The existence of the disciple is only mentioned once in the remaining part of the dialogue, i.e. when the bishop in answering as-Sarakhsī turns to his disciple and says: "Tell Aḥmad:..." (MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol.152v/5-7; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/37-38(first column).

330 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll.152r/5-153v/7; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/17(first column)-23/23(second column).

331 This discussion is in a way resumed in the fourth topic of the dialogue which deals with the question of differences, or separations, between the Persons of the Trinity. Cf. p. 56 below. It should be noted that Hans Daiber (Daiber, *Mu'ammār*, 203) refers to this discussion and relates the opinion of Israel to the doctrine of *περιχώρησις*. By constantly referring to Monophysite doctrine, though, Hans Daiber seems to ignore the fact that Israel was a Nestorian.

332 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 153v/3-7; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/18-23(second column).

333 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 153v/7-154v/5; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/24(second column)-24/10(first column). This part of the dialogue is ignored by Matti

with aspects of the Trinitarian doctrine. In contrast to this, the third topic actually concerns the distinction between contradiction (مناقضة) and alterity (غيرية), though the question asked by as-Sarakhsī really has to do with another issue in the contemporary interconfessional controversy, i.e. to what extent authoritative tradition (خبر)³³⁴ is dependent on assent (تواطؤ): "The dependence in your faith (نحلتكم)³³⁵ on authoritative tradition: Can it be both with assent and without (بغير) assent?"³³⁶

The bishop's affirmative answer causes great astonishment on the part of as-Sarakhsī. It is obvious that as-Sarakhsī interprets Israel's affirmation as an affirmation of the simultaneous validity and contradiction of a proposition.

In giving the reason for his affirmative answer, Israel distinguishes between alterity (غيرية) and contradiction (مناقضة). An affirmative proposition has several alterities which may be true without rendering the affirmative proposition false. But to a single affirmative proposition there is only one contradiction, and the two cannot be valid at the same time. According to Israel, the correct formulation of as-Sarakhsī's question should have been: "Can authoritative tradition be with assent and not (لا) with assent?"³³⁷ Israel finally illustrates his point by means of an example:

"If you should say: 'Can there be God and no (لا) God in heaven?', one would have to say: 'No'. But if you say: 'other than (غير) God', then there are angels and birds etc."³³⁸

Elia of Damascus summarizes the further discussion of this topic with a fourth eulogistic description of Israel's excellence:

"The bishop started to elucidate his doctrine and to confirm his argument with convincing eloquence and inimitable proof, while everyone was astonished at the logical inferences the bishop drew and the rational testimonies he adduced. And people were silent for a long time."³³⁹

Moosa in his presentation of the dialogue (Moosa, *A new source*, 21), though it is included in his translation, which reveals a series of misunderstandings.

334 This word is incorrectly translated by "predicate" in Moosa, *A new source*, 23/26,41(second column).

335 This word which has been furnished with the wrong diacritical points in the manuscript (بحليكم) has been misinterpreted as انجيلكم ("your Gospel") in Moosa, *A new source*, 23/26(second column) and note 13.

336 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 153v/8-9; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/25-27(second column).

337 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 154r/6-7; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/41(second column). Matti Moosa's translation of this passage is not correct.

338 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 154r/10-12; Moosa, *A new source*, 23/45(second column)-24/1(first column).

339 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 154v/1-5; Moosa, *A new source*,

The fourth and final topic³⁴⁰ of the dialogue links up with the second topic by resuming the Trinitarian discussion. as-Sarakhsī wants to know if there is any separation (فصل) between the three hypostases of the Trinity. Having received an affirmative answer from Israel, as-Sarakhsī goes on to ask whether it is substantial or accidental. This time the bishop answers in the negative. The separation is neither substantial nor accidental, but imaginary (وهي), such as occurs between bodies which are spiritual and simple,³⁴¹ as well as between a subject and its attributes.

In order to make his point clear, Israel gives some further examples of imaginary separation: that between a person and his life and his reason;³⁴² that between the heat, light and dryness of fire;³⁴³ water with its coldness and its humidity;³⁴⁴ air with its heat and its humidity;³⁴⁵ earth with its coldness and its dryness;³⁴⁶ and the sun with its light and its rays.³⁴⁷

If even created bodies - so Israel concludes his reasoning³⁴⁸ - may be separated by means of a separation which is neither accidental nor substantial, the more so, then, their Creator.

Elia's account of the debate closes with a short epilogue.³⁴⁹ as-Sarakhsī and those who were with him made the obligation of the noon prayer the pretext for leaving. When as-Sarakhsī's defeat was related to al-Kindī, the master was very disturbed and forbade his disciple to debate further with the bishop.

24/5-10(first column).

340 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 154v/5-156r/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/10(first column)-24/3(second column).

341 Mistranslated in Moosa, *A new source*, 24/16-17(first column): "between the incorporeal and corporeal elements".

342 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/2-4; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/8-12(second column).

343 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/4-8; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/12-17(second column).

344 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/8-9; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/17-18(second column).

345 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/9; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/18-19(second column).

346 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/10; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/19(second column).

347 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 155v/10-11; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/20(second column).

348 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, foll. 155v/11-156r/4; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/20-31(second column). Matti Moosa's translation is not correct.

349 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 156r/5-11; Moosa, *A new source*, 24/32-41(second column).

2.2.2.3 The question of historicity and literary genre

Having summarized the contents of the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and Aḥmad ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī and the information in praise of Israel which may be gathered from it, a few words must be said about the historicity of the debate. Did such a debate as that related by Elia of Damascus ever take place? The narrative itself certainly wants us to believe this. But in view of the idealized picture of Israel, presented especially in Elia's eulogistic accounts of the bishop,³⁵⁰ and the embarrassing outlook of the defeated philosopher, it is evident that the present account is biased.

This literary genre of an interreligious debate in the presence of an enthusiastic audience is fairly common in Christian Arabic literature. Usually, the Christian is a monk or a bishop - as is the case with Israel - while the Muslim very often is a state official - like the 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Mahdī.³⁵¹ Or else the debate takes place in the presence of a state official - like the Ayyūbīd emir al-Malik al-Mushammar.³⁵²

Unfortunately, this literary genre has never been the subject of comprehensive study. But some significant remarks on the genre of the dialogue have been made by Georg Graf.³⁵³ He distinguishes between, on the one hand, reports from actual historical dialogues between a Christian and a Muslim, and, on the other, similar texts in which the religious conversation is a mere literary fiction providing a framework for the refutation of Muslim accusations.³⁵⁴ The dialogue between Timothy I and al-Mahdī is an example of the former,³⁵⁵ while the dialogue between Abraham of Tiberias and the emir 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Hāshimī ³⁵⁶ exemplifies the latter.³⁵⁷

Characteristic of the fictitious dialogues is, first, that the Christian participant, by means of intellectual reasoning, soundly defeats his Muslim opponent, so that the Muslim is silenced and has to leave the place with

³⁵⁰ Cf. pp. 52 (notes 314 and 317), 54 (with note 332), 55 (with note 339) above.

³⁵¹ In the dialogue between the Nestorian catholicos Timothy I and the caliph al-Mahdī (Timothy I, *Muḥāwara*). Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 114-118; and *ISCH* 1 (1975), 153 (no. 12.5).

³⁵² In the dialogue between George the Monk and three Muslim shaykhs (George the Monk, *Mujādala*). Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 79-81; and *ISCH* 7 (1981), 299-307.

³⁵³ Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 831-833.

³⁵⁴ Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 831.

³⁵⁵ Timothy I, *Muḥāwara*. Cf. note 351 above.

³⁵⁶ Abraham of Tiberias, *Mujādala*. Cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 28-30; *ISCH* 1 (1975), 157-158 (no. 12.11); and Vollers, *Religionsgespräch*, 29-36.

³⁵⁷ It should be noted, however, that the recent editor of the dialogue of Abraham of Tiberias strongly defends the historicity of the shorter of the two existing recensions of the dialogue (Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade*, 97-105).

shame,³⁵⁸ while the state official, if one is present, acknowledges the superiority of the Christian participant over his Muslim opponent; secondly, that the victory of the Christian participant results in some kind of material reward³⁵⁹ on the part of the state official.³⁶⁰ Such an outcome of the dialogues, Graf remarks,³⁶¹ suggests that they have been composed as fictitiously historical documents in support of rights which were endangered; or, that already existing dialogues have been expanded and changed into such documents.

In the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī no material privileges are granted, but there is another context in which this dialogue, nevertheless, may have had a kind of political function. The dialogue may have functioned as a propaganda pamphlet in support of Israel as the patriarchal candidate against his rival Enosh.³⁶² Of course, this is only a hypothesis, and it does not necessarily imply that the whole idea of a dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī is fictitious, but merely that the present form of the account, with its frame story and its eulogistic descriptions of Israel, is so biased and exaggerated that one has to imagine some sort of *Sitz im Leben* for it.

2.3 Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)

For this second Israel of Kashkar³⁶³ - a century younger than his namesake and the fifty-fourth catholicos according to the list of Elia of Damascus³⁶⁴ - we again have to rely mainly on the patriarchal history in *Kitāb al-majdal*.³⁶⁵

Like several other East Syrian catholicoi from the ninth to the eleventh centuries,³⁶⁶ this Israel originated from the town of Karkh Jiddān,³⁶⁷ in the province of Beth Garmai north of Baghdad.

The first really significant information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) in *Kitāb al-majdal* is the fact that he was a teacher in the school of Mār Mārī,³⁶⁸ i.e. the school attached to the monastery of Dayr Qunnā,³⁶⁹

³⁵⁸ Cf. the epilogue of the dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī (p. 56 above, with note 349).

³⁵⁹ For instance permission to fish in certain waters without paying the normal fees in George the Monk, *Mujādala*, 114-115.

³⁶⁰ Cf. Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 832.

³⁶¹ Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 832.

³⁶² Cf. pp. 49-50 above.

³⁶³ See Le Quien, *Oriens christianus* 2, 1136, 1166; Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 618; Steinschneider, *Polemische*, 126 (no. 106b.); Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156; and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179, 181.

³⁶⁴ MS Vat. ar. 157, fol. 82r/15; Assemani, *De Catholicis*, 269, 270 (no. 54).

³⁶⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16-99/16; 2, 91/7-93/6.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 73.

³⁶⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16; 2, 91/7-8. For this town, cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 71-74.

situated about 90 km south-east of Baghdad on the eastern bank of the Tigris. The reason for the monastery and the school being named after Mār Mārī, is that the tomb of the saint was located at this place.³⁷⁰ The monastery, together with its famous school, was built by Mār 'Abdā in the late fourth century.³⁷¹

During the ninth and tenth centuries, the community attached to Dayr Qunnā was renowned especially for its Nestorian secretaries, who played a considerable political role in the 'Abbāsīd administration, and could even be appointed viziers if they converted to Islam, which many of them did.³⁷² As Christians they referred to the Najrān convention, which granted Christians certain privileges, in order to achieve general recognition,³⁷³ and having adopted the Islamic faith, they claimed to be of Yemenite origin.³⁷⁴

The ecclesiastical importance of Dayr Qunnā is evident from the many instances in *Kitāb al-majdal* where Dayr Qunnā is mentioned.³⁷⁵ The tomb of Mār Mārī in the monastery was one of the places which the newly-consecrated catholicos was expected to visit.³⁷⁶ Besides Israel, we know of at least two other teachers at the Mār Mārī school in the tenth century: the future catholicos Ishū'yāb ibn Hizqiyāl (1020-1025),³⁷⁷ and notably the famous logician Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus³⁷⁸ who was one of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's teachers.³⁷⁹

Further, we are told that Israel entered monastic life in the monastery of Mār Sabrīshū'³⁸⁰ - one of the two monasteries in the vicinity of Kashkar³⁸¹ - and that he was ordained bishop of Kashkar by the catholicos

³⁶⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16; 2, 91/8.

³⁶⁹ For the history and significance of this monastery, cf. ash-Shābushfī, *Kitāb ad-diyārāt*, 171-176, 248-250; 'Awwād, *Dayr Qunnā*; Sourdel, *Dayr Qunnā*; and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 67, 187-193, 246-248.

³⁷⁰ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 2/5-6.

³⁷¹ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 189.

³⁷² Cf. Massignon, *La politique islamo-chrétienne, passim*; Sourdel, *Dayr*, 194; Sourdel, *Dayr Qunnā*; Sourdel, *Le vizirat 'abbāsīde*, 304; and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 190.

³⁷³ Cf. Sourdel, *Dayr Qunnā*; and Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 190.

³⁷⁴ Cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 190,

³⁷⁵ Cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 191.

³⁷⁶ Cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 191.

³⁷⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 117/1; 2, 97/3-4. According to Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 190, he was a pupil of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962).

³⁷⁸ an-Naḏīm, *Fihrist*, 263/24 (Dodge 2, 630); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 235/3; al-Qifī, *Ta'rikh*, 323/9; Ibn al-'Ibrī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 285/6-7.

³⁷⁹ Cf. p. 18 (with note 8) above.

³⁸⁰ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16-17; 2, 91/8-9.

³⁸¹ The other one was that of Mār Gabriel. For the two monasteries, cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 170-172 (with references).

Emanuel³⁸²) whose catholicate lasted from 938 till 960.³⁸³

When the catholicos Emanuel had died on the 8th of April 960,³⁸⁴ Israel, at the age of 90, came to al-Madā'in in order to guard the see.³⁸⁵ When the new catholicos was to be elected, people disagreed on whom to elect, and it was only after having appealed to the caliph al-Muṭī' (946-974) and the Buwayhid general (and actual ruler) Mu'izz ad-Dawla³⁸⁶ that Israel could be consecrated catholicos in al-Madā'in on the 29th of May 962.³⁸⁷ Israel's great age did not presuppose a long period as catholicos. Less than four months after his consecration, Israel died on the 17th of September 962³⁸⁸ and was buried beside Emanuel³⁸⁹ in the cathedral in Dār ar-Rūm in Baghdad.³⁹⁰

According to *Kitāb al-majdal*,³⁹¹ Israel was famous for his piety, his chastity, and his asceticism. It is even stated that having become catholicos, he did not care to break the seals of the patriarchal residence and refrained from inspecting the heritage of his deceased predecessor, though it was magnificent and plentiful.³⁹² We are also told³⁹³ that he was renowned for his ability to look into the future. As an illustration of Israel's clairvoyance it is said³⁹⁴ that Israel once predicted the victorious outcome of a military campaign undertaken by al-Muṭī' and Mu'izz ad-Dawla. When asked about the outcome of the campaign, Israel had answered the caliph and the emir: "On such and such a day you will reign over the country without a sparrow's blood having been shed".³⁹⁵ Israel's prediction came true, and al-Muṭī' and Mu'izz ad-Dawla were mightily impressed.³⁹⁶ According to *Kitāb al-majdal*,³⁹⁷ it was due to this incident that al-Muṭī' and Mu'izz ad-Dawla benevolently made the appointment of Israel as catholicos possible.³⁹⁸

In connection with the meeting between Israel and the two leaders of the

382 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/17.

383 For Emanuel, see *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 94/17-98/15; 2, 84/20-91/6.

384 *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 90/19-91/2.

385 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/21-22; 2, 91/16-19.

386 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 99/1-8.

387 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 99/8; 2, 91/19-20.

388 *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 93/3-4.

389 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 99/13.

390 *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 93/4.

391 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/17; 2, 91/7,9-10.

392 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 99/13-14; 2, 92/18-93/1.

393 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/17; 2, 91/10.

394 *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 91/11-16. Cf. *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/18-20.

395 *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 91/14-15. Cf. *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/19.

396 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/19-20; 2, 91/15-16.

397 *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 99/7-8.

398 Cf. pp. 74-75 below; and Holmberg, *A refutation of the Jews*.

empire, it is worth mentioning that *Kitāb al-majdal* relates an episode which reveals Israel as an opponent of the Buwayhid infiltration in the 'Abbāsid caliphate. Israel is said to have admitted the caliph al-Mu'izz into the sanctuary of a church, while preventing Mu'izz ad-Dawla from entering along with the caliph. When the Buwayhid emir asked Israel why he was not allowed to enter when the caliph was allowed to do so, Israel is supposed to have answered: "He is the king and leader of the country".³⁹⁹

In addition to what has been related above, the only other important information about Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) which may be gathered from *Kitāb al-majdal* is an alleged disputation with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā.⁴⁰⁰ But since the attribution of this disputation to the tenth-century Israel is obviously false, I will deal with it elsewhere.⁴⁰¹

2.4 Works attributed to "Israel, bishop of Kashkar" or an anonymous bishop of Kashkar

We know of several works attributed to an "Israel, bishop of Kashkar", or, in one case, an anonymous bishop of Kashkar. But the fact that there are no less than two bishops of Kashkar of this name makes it necessary to consider which of the two bishops should be regarded as the author in each case.

2.4.1 The discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā

The Melkite Qusṭā ibn Lūqā⁴⁰² was a famous and versatile scholar from the town of Ba'labakk in Syria. By travelling in the Byzantine Empire,⁴⁰³ he collected materials for his later work as a translator and scientist. Having returned to Syria, he was invited to Iraq in order to translate works from Greek into Arabic.⁴⁰⁴ Later, the Armenian prince Sanḥarīb called him to Armenia, where he settled and devoted the last part of his life to scholarly work until his death in 912.⁴⁰⁵

In the account of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) in *Kitāb al-majdal*,⁴⁰⁶ it is

³⁹⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/20-21.

⁴⁰⁰ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/2-18.

⁴⁰¹ Cf. pp. 61-66 below.

⁴⁰² Cf. an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 295/5-23 (Dodge 2, 694-695); Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 244/14-245/26; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 262/10-263/22; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 30-32; Hill, *Qusṭā b. Lūqā; ISCH* 1 (1975), 160 (no. 12.20); Nwyia-Samir, *Une correspondance*, 546-549 (28-31); Cheikh-Hechaïmé, *Les savants*, 201-204 (no. 249).

⁴⁰³ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 262/11.

⁴⁰⁴ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 262/12-13.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, *Uyūn* 1, 244/22-26; al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 263/15-22.

⁴⁰⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/2-18.

stated that Qusṭā ibn Lūqā met Israel while the latter was bishop of Kashkar,⁴⁰⁷ and that the two had a discussion on the Christological issue from which a question posed by the Melkite and Israel's answer to it are quoted.⁴⁰⁸

Since we know that Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) was ordained bishop of Kashkar by the catholicos Emanuel (938-960),⁴⁰⁹ while Qusṭā ibn Lūqā died as early as 912, having spent the last part of his life in Armenia, we are confronted with a chronological problem. The anachronism in *Kitāb al-majdal* has been observed by Georg Graf⁴¹⁰ and by Michel Allard,⁴¹¹ but to my knowledge no one has suggested any solution to the problem.

I can think of at least two possible solutions. Either the attribution of the text quoted in *Kitāb al-majdal*⁴¹² to the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar is justified, in which case the frame story⁴¹³ has to be regarded as unhistorical, or else the frame story as well as the text quoted actually refer to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar though the author of *Kitāb al-majdal*, or his source, has incorrectly put the text and the story in connection with his younger namesake. If either of these proposed solutions is correct, I consider the latter more plausible than the former. There are several reasons for this.

First, the ninth-century Israel - also bishop of Kashkar - is more famous for his knowledge,⁴¹⁴ his intelligence and his skill in debate⁴¹⁵ than the tenth-century Israel, whose main characteristics seem to have been piety, chastity, asceticism, and the ability to foretell the future.⁴¹⁶

Secondly, the frame story as found in *Kitāb al-majdal*⁴¹⁷ fits perfectly with the chronology of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar. We know that Qusṭā ibn Lūqā spent a period of his life in Iraq before he finally settled in Armenia.⁴¹⁸ This period may well have partly coincided with those years when the ninth-century Israel was bishop of Kashkar (860-872). According to al-Qifṭī,⁴¹⁹ Qusṭā ibn Lūqā was a contemporary of Ya'qūb ibn Ishāq al-

⁴⁰⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/3.

⁴⁰⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/3-17.

⁴⁰⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 98/17.

⁴¹⁰ Graf, *GCAL* 2, 32. But on p. 156 in the same work he accepts the attribution to the tenth-century Israel (cf. Graf, *Literatur*, 38). Cf. pp. 66-67 below.

⁴¹¹ Allard, *Les chrétiens*, 385.

⁴¹² *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/5-17.

⁴¹³ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/3-4, 17-18.

⁴¹⁴ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/12. Cf. p. 49 above.

⁴¹⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/20 (cf. p. 49 above); and Israel's dialogue with as-Sarakhsī (cf. pp. 51-56, *passim*, above).

⁴¹⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/17; 2, 91/7, 9-10. Cf. p. 60 above.

⁴¹⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/3-417-18.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. p. 61 above.

⁴¹⁹ al-Qifṭī, *Ta'rikh*, 262/13.

Kindī (d. 873) which may indicate when Qusṭā ibn Lūqā lived in Baghdad. an-Nadīm's⁴²⁰ account of the discussion of who was the more excellent, Qusṭā ibn Lūqā or Ḥunayn ibn Ishāq (d. 873), may also be interpreted to the same effect.

Thirdly, if the younger tenth-century Israel of Kashkar is to be accepted as the author of the text quoted by 'Amr ibn Mattā (13th cent.)⁴²¹ in *Kitāb al-majdal*, the frame story has to be regarded as an invention.⁴²² It is unlikely that the frame story should have been invented by 'Amr ibn Mattā who in general exhibits an accurate knowledge of chronology.⁴²³ One would not expect him to deliberately invent a story whose chronological impossibility he must have been aware of. Consequently, it may be assumed that the kernel of the frame story, viz. that Qusṭā ibn Lūqā met Israel of Kashkar and had a theological discussion with him, was already at hand in the source from which 'Amr ibn Mattā drew his knowledge. If so, we may consider two possibilities. Either this source has invented the frame story and connected it with a text which is actually to be attributed to the tenth-century Israel, or the same source has transmitted a frame story which is authentic and originally belongs to the text, but has attributed the whole thing to the wrong Israel. Since the frame story, as has already been mentioned,⁴²⁴ fits in perfectly well with the chronology of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, together with the fact that Mārī ibn Sulaymān does not mention a discussion between Qusṭā ibn Lūqā and an Israel, it is more natural, I think, to accept the second possibility and to regard the attribution to the tenth-century Israel as a mistake committed by someone less competent than 'Amr ibn Mattā and at a period when the two Israels were distant historical figures difficult to keep apart.

Having argued for an attribution of the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), I will quote and comment on the short passage as it is found in *Kitāb al-majdal*.⁴²⁵

1. When this father was bishop over Kashkar, the Melkite Qusṭā ibn Lūqā stayed with him and asked him one day: "Whence do you necessitate that Christ is two hypostases?"

2. And Israel answered him: "All Christians have agreed that Christ is the eternal Son of God, and man of our substance, and that the Word of God is a hypostasis.

⁴²⁰ an-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 295/6-7 (Dodge 2, 694).

⁴²¹ Cf. p. 42 (note 226) above.

⁴²² Cf. p. 62 above.

⁴²³ Many of the events which are undated in Mārī ibn Sulaymān's (cf. p. 42, note 225, above) history of the catholicoi are furnished with dates by 'Amr ibn Mattā.

⁴²⁴ Cf. pp. 62-63 above.

⁴²⁵ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/2-18. The division into paragraphs is mine. The words in square brackets are Ṣahīb ibn Yuhannā's (cf. p. 43, note 227, above) additions.

3. We find that everything sensible and intelligible falls into four categories: it is either a generic substance, or a particular substance, or an accident adhering to a substance and not self-subsisting, or a faculty of the substance.

4. The Christians reject that Christ is an accident or a faculty of the substance, because neither of them subsists in itself and neither of them exists except in a substance.

5. If the human nature of Christ were an accident or a faculty - and an accident and a faculty do not subsist in themselves - then the human nature of Christ would not subsist in itself. And what does not subsist in itself is neither a hypostasis nor a substance.

6. If it⁴²⁶ were a generic substance which is a species, then it would not be perceptible by the senses, and all people would necessarily be 'christs'.

7. If three of the four categories are invalid, there remains the fourth category, which is the particular substance, i.e. the hypostasis which subsists in itself, like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob - whose descendant he⁴²⁷ is. And he has the attributes of the hypostasis like each one of them, except sin."

8. When he heard this, Qusṭā ibn Lūqā remained silent and did not give any answer, but kissed the earth and withdrew.

The fourfold division of everything sensible and intelligible in this passage is of Aristotelian origin.⁴²⁸ I have found the same division in two other Nestorian authors writing in Arabic.

In an epistle on the contingency of the world and the Unity and Trinity of the Creator, the metropolitan Elia of Nisibis (d. 1046)⁴²⁹ argues that the three persons of the Trinity are hypostases (أقانيم), and nothing else:

"Every existing thing which is not a composite faculty (قوة مركبة)⁴³⁰ or an accident (عرض)⁴³¹ necessarily divides into either common substance (كيان عام) or particular hypostasis (اقنوم خاص) according to what logical rules and the Syriac language require. If it is affirmed that the Creator is one and unique, his essence, his word and his life must be three hypostases (أقانيم), because they cannot be three substances (أكيان), or three composite faculties (قوى مركبة), or three accidents (أعراض)."⁴³²

426 I.e. the human nature of Christ.

427 I.e. Christ.

428 Cf. e.g. Aristotle, *Categoriae*, 1a/20-1b/9. Cf. Badawī, *Manṭiq Aristū* I, 34/7-22.

429 For Elia of Nisibis, cf. p. 21 (note 56) above.

430 Like the heat of fire, or the coldness of water. Elia of Nisibis, *Risāla fī ḥudūth al-'ālam*, 101/2.

431 Like the whiteness of snow. Elia of Nisibis, *Risāla fī ḥudūth al-'ālam*, 101/3.

The second example of the four categories of existence I draw from 'Ammār al-Baṣrī⁴³³ who flourished during the first half of the ninth century. The lines to be quoted are found in the chapter dealing with the doctrine on the Trinity.⁴³⁴

"Know that things inevitably belong to one of four categories: either substance (جوهر), as when you say 'man'; or, hypostasis (قنوم), as when you say 'Moses, David and Solomon'; or, faculties (قوى), like the heat of fire and the radiance of the sun; or, accident (عرض), like the blackness of what is black and the whiteness of what is white."⁴³⁵

Then 'Ammār al-Baṣrī⁴³⁶ goes on to explain that of these four categories the substance and the hypostases are the most perfect, because only they subsist in themselves. Consequently, these two categories are the only ones suitable for describing the Unity and Trinity of God.

Though the text of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) actually answers a question with regard to Israel's Christological doctrine, implicitly it has something to say about Israel's Trinitarian doctrine. The fact that the two other Nestorian authors apply the same line of thought in connection with the hypostases of the Trinity, clearly shows that this is the case.

Israel's example of what a hypostasis is - "like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob"⁴³⁷ - is also relevant in the context of the doctrine on God's Unity and Trinity, and implies an affirmation of a divine Unity according to species. One may even say that the example in the first place belongs to the context of Trinitarian argument. This is corroborated by the triplicity of the example as well as by the contexts of the passages quoted above from Elia of Nisibis and 'Ammār al-Baṣrī. Moreover, exactly the same example is given by 'Ammār al-Baṣrī⁴³⁸ in explaining what the hypostases of the Trinity are like.

To sum up, I have argued for an attribution of the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and not to his younger namesake. In addition to this, I have endeavoured to show that, though the question actually dealt with in the discussion is a Christological

⁴³² Elia of Nisibis, *Risāla fī ḥudūth al-'ālam*, 101/3-8.

⁴³³ For 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 210-211 (though Graf wrongly places him between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries); Hayek, 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, 13-46, v - 1 1; Griffith, *The concept of al-uqnūm*, *passim*, Griffith, 'Ammār al-Baṣrī's *Kitāb al-Burhān*, *passim*.

⁴³⁴ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān*, 46/7-56/12.

⁴³⁵ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān*, 51/5-7.

⁴³⁶ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-burhān*, 51/7-14.

⁴³⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/15-16 (= § 7 on p. 64 above).

⁴³⁸ E.g. 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-masā'il*, 171/15 and 173/2.

one, the line of argumentation employed - with its four categories - and the example of what a hypostasis is really belong to the context of Trinitarian doctrine.

2.4.2 *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*

This book on the principles of religion is mentioned by Abū l-Barakāt ibn Kabar⁴³⁹ who attributes it to "Israel, bishop of Kashkar". Though Paul Sbath⁴⁴⁰ claimed to know of a manuscript containing this work, we have to regard it as no longer extant, since the manuscripts mentioned by Sbath in his *al-Fihris* seem to have vanished, or are at least impossible to trace.

Since we do not have recourse to the text of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, nothing can be said about its contents. There is no compelling reason to regard - as Georg Graf⁴⁴¹ does - the passage attributed to "Israel, bishop of Kashkar" in Chapter 6 of al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū uṣūl ad-dīn*⁴⁴² as an extract from *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, though it is of course possible.

In fact we do not even know to which of the two bishops of Kashkar called Israel we are to attribute *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*. To my knowledge, Joseph Simonius Assemani⁴⁴³ is the only scholar who has advocated an attribution of the work to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). Georg Graf⁴⁴⁴ argues for an attribution of the work to the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) on the basis that this Israel is supposed to have discussed the Christological issue with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā⁴⁴⁵ and consequently seems to have been interested in theological questions. Paul Sbath⁴⁴⁶ likewise gives the tenth-century Israel as the author of the work. And so does Rachid Haddad⁴⁴⁷ without even arguing for his opinion. I suspect that both Paul Sbath and Rachid Haddad merely depend on Georg Graf's judgement.⁴⁴⁸ A more cautious attitude is adopted by Jean-Maurice Fiey,⁴⁴⁹ who refers to Georg Graf's suggestion but refrains from deciding which of the two bishops might be the author of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*.

⁴³⁹ Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 302/10-11 (= Riedel, *Katalog*, 652/3-4).

⁴⁴⁰ Sbath, *al-Fihris* 1, 29 (no. 202).

⁴⁴¹ Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁴⁴² Cf. pp. 75-78 below.

⁴⁴³ Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 513. Perhaps Khalil Samir (in Abū l-Barakāt, *Miṣbāḥ*, 302, note 3) also has the ninth-century Israel in mind, though his reference is rather vague (cf. p. 76, with note 540, below). Cf. Steinschneider, *Polemische*, 126.

⁴⁴⁴ Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156. Cf. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus* 2, 1166.

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. p. 61 (note 402) above.

⁴⁴⁶ Sbath, *al-Fihris* 1, 29 (author no. 53, work no. 202).

⁴⁴⁷ Haddad, *La Trinité*, 66.

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. note 444 above.

⁴⁴⁹ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179, 181.

both being equally famous for their knowledge and their talent as controversialists.

When put to the test, Georg Graf's reason for attributing the work to the tenth-century Israel is a very weak one. In arguing for the tenth-century Israel being the author of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, Graf⁴⁵⁰ takes the attribution of the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā to this younger Israel for granted. In another place, though, Graf himself⁴⁵¹ admits that the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā, for chronological reasons, cannot be attributed to the tenth-century Israel.

As I have already shown,⁴⁵² there are good reasons to regard the older ninth-century Israel as the author of the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā. If this is the case, and if we accept the main idea in Graf's reasoning, viz. that the bishop who debated with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā had shown an interest in theological questions and therefore is the most likely choice as author of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, we are brought face to face with the older ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) as the most plausible author of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*.

Jean-Maurice Fiey's⁴⁵³ allegation that the two Kashkarian bishops are equally famous for their knowledge and their talent as controversialists cannot be accepted straight off, presupposing as it does the attribution of the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā to the tenth-century Israel.⁴⁵⁴ In fact, the ninth-century Israel has a better reputation as a theologian and controversialist than his younger namesake,⁴⁵⁵ which again seems to indicate that *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna* should be attributed to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) rather than to his tenth-century namesake.

2.4.3 A refutation of the Jews (MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61)

This refutation of the Jews⁴⁵⁶ entitled *Masā'il fī r-radd 'alā l-Yahūd min al-'aql wa-n-naql* is to my knowledge only extant in MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61⁴⁵⁷ where it occupies folios 62r- 120v.⁴⁵⁸ The text ends

⁴⁵⁰ Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁴⁵¹ Graf, *GCAL* 2, 32.

⁴⁵² Pp. 61-62 above.

⁴⁵³ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179.

⁴⁵⁴ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 181.

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. pp. 49 (with notes 283 and 284), 62 (with notes 414-416) above, and pp. 73 (with notes 516-518), 78-79 and 102 below.

⁴⁵⁶ See Holmberg, *A refutation of the Jews*.

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. Graf, *Catalogue*, 186-187 (no. 487); and Simaika, *Catalogue* 2:1, 298-299 (no. 635). The manuscript is dated the 17th of Tūt 1454 A.M. (= the 25th of September 1737 A.D.) and is written

abruptly in mid-sentence and the copyist has added a marginal note⁴⁵⁹ in which he states that the old copy where he found the text also was incomplete. The title of the refutation attributes the work to "the excellent Father Israel, bishop of Kashkar and its provinces" (ابونا اسرائيل اسقف كسكر).⁴⁶⁰

Again we have to choose between the two bishops of Kashkar called Israel, in order to decide the exact identity of the author. In contrast to the authorship of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, which has been commented on by several modern scholars,⁴⁶¹ no one has, as far as I know, expressed any opinion as to the identity of the Israel to whom the refutation of the Jews is attributed. In fact, I have only found one single reference to the refutation question apart from the two catalogues by Graf and Simaika,⁴⁶² and the refutation is ignored by Khalil Samir in his preliminary list of Christian Arabic texts relating to Jewish-Christian controversies.⁴⁶³ This reference is made by Georg Graf himself⁴⁶⁴ in a paragraph in an appendix to the third volume of his history of Christian Arabic literature. In this paragraph, Graf does not say anything about which of the two Kashkarian bishops he believed to be the author of the text in question.

Curiously enough, Georg Graf does not even seem to have thought of connecting this refutation of the Jews with the extract on the abrogation of the Mosaic law attributed to "Israel, bishop of Kashkar" and preserved by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl in the sixth chapter of his *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*,⁴⁶⁵ which would have been the most natural thing to do. Instead, Graf⁴⁶⁶ regards the passage quoted in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* as an extract from the lost *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*,⁴⁶⁷ although there is no support for this in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* itself. It is true, the extract, or rather extracts,⁴⁶⁸ from Israel quoted in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* have in all probability nothing to do with the refutation of the Jews in question.⁴⁶⁹

in the handwriting of Ḥannallāh Ghattās.

⁴⁵⁸ It should be noted, though, that the cursive Coptic foliation runs from 69 directly to 80, omitting the numbers 70 to 79. This is evidently due to a pure lapse of mind on the part of the copyist, as no folio is missing, as the identity of the catchword at the bottom of fol. 69v with the first word on fol. 80r clearly proves.

⁴⁵⁹ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 120v.

⁴⁶⁰ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 62r/3-4.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. pp 66-67 above.

⁴⁶² Cf. note 457 above.

⁴⁶³ Samir, *Terre-Sainte*, 415-416.

⁴⁶⁴ Graf, *GCAL* 3, 520.

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. pp. 75-78 below.

⁴⁶⁶ Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. p. 66 (with note 441) above, and pp. 75-76 below.

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. p. 75 below.

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. pp. 77-78 below.

this is only evident from a close study of the text in MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61* in comparison with the passage quoted in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*. Had Graf himself undertaken such a close study, he would certainly not have treated the refutation of the Jews merely in a paragraph in an appendix, as is the case.⁴⁷⁰ Consequently, it remains curious why Graf never associated the refutation of the Jews with the extract in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*.

However, we are not completely at a loss when trying to decide which Israel of Kashkar we are dealing with in the refutation of the Jews, since its approximate date of composition may be inferred from a statement by the author according to which a period of 900 years and more (مقدار تسعمئة سنة) has elapsed since the advent of Christ.⁴⁷¹ Due to the vagueness of the expression ذلك وأكثر من ذلك, it is not possible to determine the date with any exactitude, but if we say that the refutation was written towards the middle of the tenth century, we are probably on the safe side. If this inference is valid, we may conclude that the author of the refutation is the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 962), and not his older namesake who died as early as 872.

Before accepting this conclusion, however, two other passages, which are, strictly speaking, inconsistent with the statement referred to above, have to be explained. In one of them,⁴⁷² the author compares the Jews' exile to Babylon, which lasted seventy years, with the present wrath of God against the Jews which has lasted a thousand years (هذا السخط الذي دام ألف سنة).⁴⁷³ Since the author probably regards the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 as the starting point for this "wrath", the addition of a thousand years would bring us to A.D. 1070, i.e. a date considerably later than the middle of the tenth century which we deduced from the first passage above.

The other passage⁴⁷⁴ is even more explicit. Here the author states that the temple has remained in ruins for a thousand years, which again would indicate that the author composed his refutation of the Jews in the year 1070.

The "thousand years" in the two latter passages could be explained as an adaptation of the text by a later copyist who wanted to update the refutation, in order to make the argument more relevant to his own time. But if we accept this explanation, we have to reckon with the possibility that the first passage quoted above,⁴⁷⁵ according to which 900 years and more have elapsed since the advent of Christ, is also an adaptation, but made by an earlier copyist. In this perspective, we are still uncertain who the author of the refutation really is, the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being a

⁴⁷⁰ Graf, *GCAL* 3, 520.

⁴⁷¹ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/2-3.

⁴⁷² MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/5-10.

⁴⁷³ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/10.

⁴⁷⁴ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 92r/9-10.

⁴⁷⁵ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/2-3.

candidate as plausible as his tenth-century namesake.

The possibility of an adaptation, such as the one suggested above has been discussed by scholars with regard to a completely different text. Since the two cases present striking similarities, it is necessary to refer briefly to this discussion.

In MS *London, British Library Oriental 4950*,⁴⁷⁶ an anonymous Christian Arabic theological summa⁴⁷⁷ is found on folios 1-197v as the first of two works contained in the manuscript. Since the second work in the manuscript is Theodore Abū Qurra's apology for the practice of venerating icons,⁴⁷⁸ it has been suggested⁴⁷⁹ that this Melkite "disciple" of John of Damascus is the author of the anonymous summa. This is not the place to reproduce all the arguments in this case. I will therefore confine myself to the one issue relevant for our purpose.

In 1962, Joshua Blau⁴⁸⁰ drew attention to a line in the anonymous summa⁴⁸¹ according to which the temple has remained in ruins for 800 years and more.⁴⁸² In Joshua Blau's judgment,⁴⁸³ this passage proves that Theodore Abū Qurra cannot be the author of the work, since 800 years from the fall of Jerusalem would bring us to the year A.D. 870, i.e. a date when Theodore Abū Qurra was no longer alive.

Khalil Samir⁴⁸⁴ does not accept Joshua Blau's judgment, but prefers to regard the line about the 800 years having passed since the temple was ruined as an alteration made by the copyist Stephen of Ramla - who transcribed the manuscript in A.D. 877 - in order to make the text suit the requirements of his own time. Khalil Samir⁴⁸⁵ claims to know of other such instances where copyists have adapted dates.

In contrast to this, Sidney Griffith⁴⁸⁶ approves of Joshua Blau's interpretation of this line, and he argues against the allegation that the copyist altered the number of years having elapsed since the fall of the temple in order to update the work. According to Griffith, "this allegation

⁴⁷⁶ Cf. Ellis-Edwards, *A descriptive list*, 69.

⁴⁷⁷ Anonymous, *Jumlat wujūh al-Imān*. For references, cf. Samir, *Somme des aspects de la foi*, *passim*; and Griffith, *A ninth century Summa*, *passim*.

⁴⁷⁸ Theodore Abū Qurra, *Maymar fī ikrām al-ʿIqūnāt*.

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. the references in Samir, *Somme des aspects de la foi*, 98-104.

⁴⁸⁰ Blau, *Über einige christlich-arabische Manuskripte*, 102.

⁴⁸¹ MS *London, British Library Oriental 4950*, fol. 154r/5 (from the bottom).

⁴⁸² N.B. the similarity with the refutation of the Jews in MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist 61*, foll. 91r/3, 10; 92r/7. Cf. also Samir, *Somme des aspects de la foi*, 104-105; Griffith, *A ninth century Summa*, 131-132; and Griffith, *Greek into Arabic*, 137.

⁴⁸³ Blau, *Über einige christlich arabische Manuskripte*, 102.

⁴⁸⁴ Samir, *Date de composition*, 368-370; Samir, *Somme des aspects de la foi*, 118.

⁴⁸⁵ Samir, *Date de composition*, 369 (I have not been able, though, to consult the work to which he refers in note 71).

⁴⁸⁶ Griffith, *A ninth century Summa*, 132.

stands opposed to what one would expect to be the normal scribal practice".⁴⁸⁷

What we may learn from this discussion about the date of the anonymous work in MS *London, British Library Oriental 4950*, is that scholars disagree as to whether scribal alterations of dates such as those we are dealing with at present do occur, or not.

Returning to the refutation of the Jews in MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, it is necessary to explain the discrepancy between, on the one hand, the first passage⁴⁸⁸ referred to above, and, on the other, the other two passages.⁴⁸⁹ According to the first passage,⁴⁹⁰ we would have to date the composition of the refutation towards the middle of the tenth century. The other two passages⁴⁹¹ seem to bring us to A.D. 1070 as the date of the author's activity. One explanation of this inconsistency would be to regard the two latter passages as alterations by a copyist who transcribed the refutation around the year 1070 and who desired to touch it up in order to make it suit the requirements of his own time.

As it is, I am not inclined to accept this explanation. In the first place, if a copyist wanted to adjust the text to suit his own time, he would certainly not content himself with altering the two latter passages, while leaving the first passage unaltered and thus create an inconsistency.⁴⁹²

Furthermore, there is a more natural explanation. The author, being a zealous polemicist, simply does not make any attempt to give exact figures, but feels free to round off the 900 years to a thousand years, especially when it is part of the argument to show that a long period is involved. The author himself admits⁴⁹³ that he has written without completeness of detail (من غير تفصيل), in order that the text should be easy to understand. Even if this statement does not refer specifically to the round number of a thousand years, it gives us a picture of the general attitude of the author who does not claim to be exact and exhaustive, but rather regards prolixity with abhorrence (كراهة التطويل).⁴⁹⁴

In addition to the author's general attitude, the context of the passage in question is revealing. The reason why the author emphasizes the long period which has elapsed since the temple was ruined is to prove that God's wrath against the Jews is definite.⁴⁹⁵ This long period, when no prophet has been

⁴⁸⁷ Griffith, *A ninth century Summa*, 132.

⁴⁸⁸ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/1-3.

⁴⁸⁹ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, foll. 91r/10 and 92r/7.

⁴⁹⁰ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 91r/1-3.

⁴⁹¹ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, foll. 91r/10 and 92r/7.

⁴⁹² As a matter of fact, there is a similar inconsistency in MS *London, British Library Oriental 4950*.

Cf. Samir, *Date de composition*, 376-381.

⁴⁹³ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, fol. 98v/8-9.

⁴⁹⁴ MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61*, foll. 99r/4 and 112r/1-2.

sent by God to the Jews, is contrasted with the Jews' exile to Babylon lasting only 70 years, during which time God showed concern for the Jews by sending them prophets and the like.⁴⁹⁶ It is interesting to note that, although the duration of the Jews' exile to Babylon is once expressly given as 70 years,⁴⁹⁷ the author twice refers to it more vaguely as having lasted a hundred years.⁴⁹⁸ This clearly shows that the author of the refutation of the Jews tends to round off numbers, and that we have good reason to regard the figure of a thousand years in the two passages⁴⁹⁹ as a round number. Indirectly, this proves the reliability of the first passage⁵⁰⁰ according to which 900 years and more have elapsed since the advent of Christ as an indication of the approximate date of the composition of the refutation. Consequently, we are obliged to attribute the work to the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar rather than to his ninth-century namesake.

This judgment is corroborated by an analysis of the structure and the nature of the refutation. In the title, the allegation is made that the author refutes the Jews on the grounds of reason and tradition (من العقل والنقل).⁵⁰¹ The claim to refute the Jews on the grounds of reason may be justified by the very genre of the work which is that of questions and answers. The chapters, or questions (مسائل), which give the refutation an external structure, are usually introduced by a formula such as يسأل اليهود⁵⁰² or simply فيقال لهم.⁵⁰³ The imagined answer of the opponents, mostly in the affirmative or the negative only, is commonly given in the protasis of a conditional sentence signaled by the formula فإن.⁵⁰⁴ In the ensuing apodosis - فيقال لهم⁵⁰⁵ - the author delivers his recommended refutation. When an alternative answer on the part of the Jews is given, the author provides it with an alternative refutation.⁵⁰⁶

The first nine such questions are numbered one through nine.⁵⁰⁷ Then follows a series of almost forty unnumbered questions divided into two sections introduced by the headings مسائل في باب الإجماع والأخبار⁵⁰⁸ and

495 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 91r/10-13.

496 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 91r/5-9.

497 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 91r/7.

498 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 91r/5 and 91v/14-15.

499 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, foll. 91r/10 and 92r/7.

500 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 91r/1-3.

501 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 62r/5.

502 E.g. MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 62r/6.

503 E.g. MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 64v/11.

504 E.g. MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 62r/8.

505 E.g. MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 62r/8.

506 E.g. MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 62r/15-62v/8.

507 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, foll. 62r/6; 63r/1; 63r/11; 63v/3; 63v/14; 64r/10; 64v/11; 65r/1 and 65r/14.

508 MS Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist. 61, fol. 65v/5.

المسائل على اليهود في باب التعديل والتحرير⁵⁰⁹ respectively.

Though, on the one hand, the claim to refute the Jews out of reason may be justified, we may, on the other hand, observe an almost total absence of philosophical terminology. This absence could be explained by the very fact that we are dealing with a manual on how to refute the Jews and that in this context the questions are not primarily of a philosophical nature, but rather concern such topics as the marks of true religion;⁵¹⁰ whether the Messiah has come or not;⁵¹¹ when the Messiah, whom the Jews expect, will come, what he will be like and what he will do when he comes;⁵¹² the importance of tradition and consensus respectively;⁵¹³ the relation between the Jews and other peoples, nations and religions;⁵¹⁴ whether and under what circumstances the dead will arise and live,⁵¹⁵ and so forth.

But the absence of philosophical terminology in the refutation of the Jews could also be interpreted as an indication of a non-philosophical mental attitude on the part of its author. If so, the picture we get of the author is more in accordance with the picture we already have of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar, whose main characteristics seem to have been piety, chastity, asceticism, and the ability to foresee the future,⁵¹⁶ than the picture we have of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar who was famous for his knowledge,⁵¹⁷ his intelligence and his skill in debate.⁵¹⁸

There is also another feature in the refutation of the Jews which could be adduced as an argument in favour of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar being its author. I have in mind certain passages which mention Islam and Muhammad and in which a tendency to make common cause with the Muslims against the Jews may be traced.

In one passage,⁵¹⁹ the author reminds his opponents that the "king of Islam" (ملك الإسلام) is many times mightier than King Solomon was, though the might of Solomon is the prototype of the might of the coming Messiah.

⁵⁰⁹ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 93r/14-15.

⁵¹⁰ E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 62r/6ff.; 65r/14ff.; 66v/12ff.; 81v/8ff.; 87v/12ff.; 88r/8ff.; and 96r/1ff.

⁵¹¹ E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 65v/5ff.; 66v/12ff.; and 67r/5ff.

⁵¹² E.g. MS Cairo *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 63v/14ff.; 102r/ ff.; 102v/2ff.; 106r/2ff.; 106v/3ff.; 109v/1ff.; 110v/4ff.; and 113v/2ff.

⁵¹³ E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 66v/12ff.; 67r/5ff.; 67r/14ff.; 68r/4ff.; 68v/8ff.; 69r/1ff.; and 81v/8ff.

⁵¹⁴ E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 93r/14ff.; 94r/10ff.; 95v/7ff.; 96r/5ff.; 103v/3ff.; 106v/3ff.; 112r/7ff.; and 113v/2ff.

⁵¹⁵ E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 64r/10ff.; 105r/7ff.; 110v/4ff.; 112r/7ff.; and 115r/9ff.

⁵¹⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/17; 2, 91/7,9-10. Cf. p. 60 above.

⁵¹⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/12. Cf. pp. 49 (with note 283) and 67 (with note 455) above.

⁵¹⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/20. Cf. pp. 49 (with note 284) and 67 (with note 455) above.

⁵¹⁹ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 64r/5-7.

In another passage,⁵²⁰ the author argues for the validity of his verdict on the Jews by stating that it is based on the consensus of two men, viz. Christ and Muḥammad. Then he goes on⁵²¹ to deal with the Christians and the Muslims as if the two religions were equally important and shared the same status, concluding that if the tradition (خبر) of Christ and Muḥammad is false, there is no consensus to be found.⁵²² In yet another passage,⁵²³ the author states that if the claims of Christianity and of "the other nation" (الأمة الأخرى),⁵²⁴ i.e. Islam, are false, then Judaism is likewise false.

This friendly attitude towards the Muslims could be explained by the fact that the author at the moment concentrates on refuting the Jews who are the common antagonists of both Christians and Muslims. In another context, he would perhaps exhibit a less favourable attitude towards Muḥammad and his followers.

But it is also possible to connect this benevolent attitude towards the Muslims with certain facts in the biography of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 962). As we already know,⁵²⁵ this Israel and future catholicos was once a teacher in the school of Mār Mārī at the monastery of Dayr Qunnā. We also know⁵²⁶ that during the ninth and the tenth centuries there were important connections between the community attached to Dayr Qunnā and the 'Abbāsīd administration, and that even on the religious plane lively connections existed between Christians and Muslims, many of the former having converted to Islam. To what extent was Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) affected by the atmosphere of Dayr Qunnā? Unfortunately, in the present state of research, it is not possible to give an exhaustive answer to the question.

But the fact that Israel (d. 962) could only be consecrated catholicos after contact with the rulers in Baghdad,⁵²⁷ may indicate that Israel during his activity as a teacher at Dayr Qunnā had been involved in political affairs in such a way that he could benefit from his involvement later in his life.⁵²⁸ The idea that the benevolence of the rulers towards Israel was due to an earlier incident, when Israel had foretold the victorious outcome of an 'Abbāsīd campaign,⁵²⁹ may not be the whole truth. On the contrary, this interpretation could be the result of a conscious effort to conceal the real

⁵²⁰ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 82r/7-9.

⁵²¹ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 82v/1-12.

⁵²² MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 82v/12.

⁵²³ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 87v/2-8.

⁵²⁴ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 87v/2.

⁵²⁵ Cf. pp. 58-59 (with note 368) above.

⁵²⁶ Cf. p. 59 above.

⁵²⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 99/7-8. Cf. pp. 60-61) above.

⁵²⁸ The episode related in *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 98/20-21 may also be relevant in this context. Cf. p. (with note) above.

⁵²⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 99/7-8.

motives for the Baghdadian rulers' benevolent attitude towards Israel, perhaps in a later generation when the political involvement associated with Dayr Qunnā was thought to be compromising.

These facts from the biography of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) and their possible implications as suggested above may very well explain the positive attitude towards the Muslims found in the refutation of the Jews. If so, this is an argument which supports the other arguments adduced above in favour of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of the refutation of the Jews.

2.4.4 The extracts on the abrogation of the Mosaic law in Chapter 6 of *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl

I now turn to two other texts attributed to an "Israel, bishop of Kashkar" whose exact identity has so far not been established. The two texts are extracts from a work which is in all probability no longer extant in its entirety. The extracts have only survived in the sixth chapter of al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*, though a text corresponding to the first extract has been found among the writings of the thirteenth-century Coptic encyclopaedist Ibn ar-Rāhib and has been edited by Louis Cheikho.⁵³⁰

Though Georg Graf⁵³¹ and those who depend on him in this particular matter⁵³² only speak of one single extract, it is quite clear that al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl has transcribed two separate extracts. The first is introduced by the words *من مقالة لاسرائيل اسقف كسكر في هذا المعنى*⁵³³ and the second by the words *ومن كلام اسقف كسكر المذكور في هذا المعنى*.⁵³⁴

In these two introductory headings it is not made explicit which of the two Kashkarian bishops by the name of Israel is to be regarded as the author of the texts. The same uncertainty applies to al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's list of authors who constitute the sources for his work. Here he mentions "the chaste Father Israel, bishop of Kashkar" (*الاب الطاهر اسرائيل اسقف*) (كسكر),⁵³⁵ without specifying which of the two bishops he has in mind.

As already mentioned,⁵³⁶ Georg Graf⁵³⁷ regarded the passage quoted

⁵³⁰ Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 63-68. I have not been able to consult the edition mentioned in Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁵³¹ Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁵³² E.g. Haddad, *La Trinité*, 66; and Samir, *Terre-Sainte*, 415.

⁵³³ *MS Paris, Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 109r/11-12.

⁵³⁴ *MS Paris, Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 110v/9-10.

⁵³⁵ *MS Paris, Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 78r/10-11. Cf. Graf, *Schriftstellerverzeichnis*, 214 (transl. 215, no. 26).

⁵³⁶ Cf. pp. 66 and 68 above.

by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl as an extract from *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-dīn* which he thought was written by the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 962).⁵³⁸ This opinion of Graf's is copied by Rachid Haddad.⁵³⁹ In his list of Christian discussions with Jews in Arabic, Khalil Samir⁵⁴⁰ attributes the extract to "Israël évêque de Kaškar (fin du 9e siècle)". As neither of the two Israels was bishop of Kashkar at the end of the ninth century - the first died in 872, perhaps the year when the second was born⁵⁴¹ - it is not clear which of the two Khalil Samir has in mind.

Since the extracts in al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* deal with the Jews and the abrogation of the Mosaic law, it is natural to compare them with the refutation of the Jews found in MS Cairo, Copt. *Patr. Hist.* 61,⁵⁴² though, as already observed,⁵⁴³ it is strange that George Graf never thought of it.

The first thing we may note is that the extracts in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* are not found in the refutation of the Jews, nor is the main issue in the extracts, viz. the abrogation of the Mosaic law, explicitly dealt with in the refutation of the Jews. This could be taken to indicate that the passages quoted by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl are actually extracts from the latter part of the refutation of the Jews which is no longer extant.⁵⁴⁴

But telling against this theory, and this is the second point we may observe, is the fact that the passages in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* are written in quite a different form from the refutation of the Jews. Nowhere in the refutation does the author give an account of what the Jews believe. Instead, his work is made up of questions directed to the Jews, and to the answers, the author provides suitable counter-attacks.⁵⁴⁵ In contrast to this, the first extract in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* commences with a fairly extensive account of what the Jews believe with regard to the issue in question, viz. the abrogation of the Mosaic law,⁵⁴⁶ whereupon follows the author's answer signalized by the word *الجواب*.⁵⁴⁷

In his answer, the author has a number of explicit scriptural references. Such references are, on the other hand, rare in the refutation of the Jews, the Book of Daniel being referred to a couple of times towards the end.⁵⁴⁸

⁵³⁷ Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156.

⁵³⁸ Graf, *Literatur*, 38; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 156. Cf. p. 66 above.

⁵³⁹ Haddad, *La Trinité*, 66.

⁵⁴⁰ Samir, *Terre-Sainte*, 415.

⁵⁴¹ We know that he was about ninety years old when Emanuel died. See *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/22-2. 91/18.

⁵⁴² Cf. pp. 67-75 above.

⁵⁴³ Cf. p. 68-69 above.

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. p. 67-68 above.

⁵⁴⁵ Cf. p. 72 above.

⁵⁴⁶ MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 109r/12-109v/8; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 63/8-64/3.

⁵⁴⁷ MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 109v/8ff.; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 64/4ff.

Since the refutation of the Jews, according to its title,⁵⁴⁹ is composed on the grounds of reason and tradition (من العقل والنقل) - the latter term, in all probability, signifying scriptural argument - it is tempting to regard the first passage⁵⁵⁰ quoted by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl as an excerpt from the latter no longer extant portion of the refutation of the Jews, a portion which, hypothetically, would be more devoted to tradition (النقل).

Besides the argument already adduced above, i.e. that the form, or genre, of the passages in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* differs fundamentally from that of the refutation, there is yet another reason for dismissing the two extracts as excerpts from the refutation. Though there are verbal⁵⁵¹ and thematic⁵⁵² parallels between the material found in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* and the refutation, there are also fundamental differences in the method of reasoning and the words employed in the method of reasoning, which I think reveal a greater philosophical awareness and training on the part of the author of the two extracts in comparison to the author of the refutation.

First, a dominant feature of the method of arguing in the two extracts is to point out inconsistencies.⁵⁵³ This kind of argument cannot be considered conspicuous in the refutation of the Jews.

Secondly, the author of the extracts frequently uses the verb *جاز* in its different grammatical forms.⁵⁵⁴ This verb, which signifies what is possible, or, if negated, what is impossible, from the point of view of intellectual reasoning and consistency, is rarely, if ever, employed by the author of the refutation.

Finally, in the second excerpt in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*, the author⁵⁵⁵

548 E.g. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 117v/2. Cf. also fol. 80v/2 (Daniel), 5 (Amos).

549 MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 62r/4-5. Cf. pp. 67 and 72 above.

550 The second passage quoted by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl (MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, foll. 110v/9-111r/7) has no scriptural references.

551 For instance, the expression *ولا يحتمل التأويل* (MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 109v/5; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 63/ult.) is also found in the refutation (MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 64v/4-5 and 66r/5-7,8); and *أخبرونا عن* (Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 64/5 [not in MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200]) may be compared with MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 95r/1; 109v/2; 113v/2; and 115r/10.

552 For instance, the distinction between *خبر* and *قياس* (MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 110r/4ff.; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 66/23ff. Cf. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 86v/10ff.); and the question of religious observance before Moses (MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 110v/18ff. Cf. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 94r/10); and the statement that the Mosaic law is adapted to the present world, while the Gospel is adapted to the world to come (MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 111r/6-7. Cf. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 89r/15ff.).

553 See especially MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, foll. 109v/13-14 and 109v/19-110r/4; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 64/10-11; 64/21; 65/2, 66/4; and 66/11.

554 E.g. MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 110v/11-18; Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 66/16 and 67/23.

555 MS Paris, *Bibl. nat. ar.* 200, fol. 110v/10ff.

reasons by saying that the obligation of the Torah has to (لا تخلو من) belong to one of three categories, and then he goes through the implications of each of these categories.⁵⁵⁶ This kind of reasoning is nowhere met with in the refutation of the Jews.

From what has so far been said, the following conclusions may be drawn. First, the passages quoted by al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl are not present in that part of the refutation of the Jews which is extant in MS *Cairo, Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61. Secondly, the same passages have in all probability not been excerpted from that part of the refutation of the Jews which has not survived. Finally, there are good reasons for believing that the author of the extracts in *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn* is not identical with the author of the refutation of the Jews, since the former exhibits a philosophical awareness and method of reasoning which are not found in the refutation. Since it has been argued⁵⁵⁷ that the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar in all probability is the author of the refutation of the Jews, it is natural to identify the author of the two extracts with the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar.

Perhaps the two extracts have been excerpted from an unknown work on the Jews by Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), or, perhaps they have been excerpted from *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*, which, as I have argued,⁵⁵⁸ should be attributed to the ninth-century Israel. But unless a copy of *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna* is found in the future, there is no way to find out the truth in this matter.

2.4.5 A Syriac liturgy of the pre-sanctified (MS *Cambridge, Univ. Libr., Add. 1988*)

In 1904, H. W. Codrington⁵⁵⁹ edited a Nestorian liturgy of the pre-sanctified, attributed, in one of the two manuscripts⁵⁶⁰ he used, to "Mār Israel the sharp of wit, bishop of Kashkar" (ܡܪܝ ܝܫܪܐܝܝܠ ܫܪܦܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܩܚܝܬܐ). Codrington⁵⁶¹ takes it for granted that the bishop intended here is the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, without even mentioning the tenth-century one. I. Ziadé does likewise.⁵⁶² It is true, the epithet (ܫܪܦܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ) given to the author of the liturgy points to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, since this epithet is more consistent with the picture we have of him than with the picture we have of the tenth-century

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā and the dialogue with as-Sarakhsī.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. pp. 67-75 above.

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. pp. 66-67 above.

⁵⁵⁹ Codrington, *Liturgies*, 538-545.

⁵⁶⁰ I.e. MS *Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Add. 1988*, the other manuscript being MS *London, British Museum Add. 7181*.

⁵⁶¹ Codrington, *Liturgies*, 535.

⁵⁶² Ziadé, *Présanctifiés*, 92-93.

Israel.⁵⁶³

On the other hand, an attribution of the liturgy to either of the two Israels is on the whole problematic. For one thing, the second manuscript used in Codrington's edition, i.e. MS *London, British Museum, Add. 7181*,⁵⁶⁴ attributes the liturgy to 'Abdīshū', metropolitan of Elam, the writer of a liturgical commentary, under the catholicos Sabrīshū' IV (A.D. 1222-1225).⁵⁶⁵ For another thing, the use of the liturgy of the pre-sanctified in the Nestorian church is obscure, since the reservation as such of the eucharistic elements is generally condemned by its doctors.⁵⁶⁶

In any case, being a liturgy in Syriac, the text somewhat falls outside the scope of the present study and need not detain us further.

2.4.6 MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, foll. 129r-156v

In connection with the two bishops of Kashkar called Israel, Jean-Maurice Fiey⁵⁶⁷ has drawn attention to what he calls "quatre traités",⁵⁶⁸ attributed to an anonymous bishop of Kashkar, in MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, foll. 129r-156v,⁵⁶⁹ an undated manuscript⁵⁷⁰ of Egyptian provenance, written in the handwriting of Barṣawmā ibn Abī l-Karam.⁵⁷¹

Actually, the "four treatises" in the Parisian manuscript are one single treatise in four chapters, a fact which W. Mac Guckin de Slane⁵⁷² was already aware of.

In the Parisian manuscript,⁵⁷³ the treatise is attributed to a "bishop of the town of Kashkar" (اسقف مدينة كسكر). This attribution is evidently false, though no one has pointed this out for the simple reason that the treatise itself has so far not been identified, not even by Gérard Troupeau in his catalogue of manuscripts.⁵⁷⁴

This is curious, since even a cursory reading of the treatise reveals that it has been written by a Monophysite, which renders the attribution to a

⁵⁶³ Cf. pp. 49, 60, 62 and 73 above.

⁵⁶⁴ Ziadé, *Présanctifiés*, 92, adds MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. syr. 283*.

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. Codrington, *Liturgies*, 535, 538, 539; and Ziadé, *Présanctifiés*, 92. For 'Abdīshū' of Elam, cf. Baumstark, *GSL*, 112 and 120 (note 3).

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. Codrington, *Liturgies*, 535-536; and Ziadé, *Présanctifiés*, 92-93, for further references.

⁵⁶⁷ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179.

⁵⁶⁸ He is probably dependent on Graf, *GCAL* 4, 37: "vier Abhandlungen".

⁵⁶⁹ Cf. Slane, *Catalogue*, 84-85 (no. 309:17); and Troupeau, *Catalogue* 1, 270-271 (no. 309:6).

⁵⁷⁰ From the 15th century, according to Slane and Troupeau (cf. the preceding note).

⁵⁷¹ MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, fol. 126v/8 (الكرم (sic!) برصوما بن أبو). Cf. Troupeau, *Catalogue* 1, 271, and *Catalogue* 2, 158 ("Barṣawmā ibn Abī Karam" (sic!)).

⁵⁷² Slane, *Catalogue*, 85.

⁵⁷³ MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, fol. 129r/3.

⁵⁷⁴ Troupeau, *Catalogue* 1, 271.

bishop of Kashkar impossible. Besides this, the treatise is in fact easy to identify, as it was edited as early as 1909 by Pierre Chébli.⁵⁷⁵ The work in question is the book of councils - *Kitāb al-majāmi'* - by Sāwīrūs ibn al-Muqaffa',⁵⁷⁶ though the introduction⁵⁷⁷ and the appendix⁵⁷⁸ are not found in MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*.

Having established the true identity of the treatise in MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, foll. 129r-156v, I have proved the incorrectness of its attribution to a bishop of Kashkar, there being no reason to doubt the authenticity of *Kitāb al-majāmi'* as a work of Sāwīrūs ibn al-Muqaffa'. Although the reason for the attribution to a bishop of Kashkar remains obscure, the treatise as such need not detain us any longer.

2.4.7 Summary

Having gone through five works attributed to an Israel of Kashkar and a sixth work attributed to an anonymous bishop of Kashkar, who in the secondary literature⁵⁷⁹ has been associated with the name of Israel of Kashkar, the results may be summarized as follows.

With regard to three of the works discussed, viz. the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā,⁵⁸⁰ *Kitāb fī uṣūl ad-diyāna*,⁵⁸¹ and the two extracts in the sixth chapter of al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*,⁵⁸² I have argued for an attribution of these works to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872).

In addition to these three works, the Syriac liturgy of the pre-sanctified⁵⁸³ should perhaps, though the matter is very doubtful, be connected with the same ninth-century Israel of Kashkar.

As for the refutation of the Jews entitled *Masā'il fī r-radd 'alā l-Yahūd min al-'aql wa-n-naql*,⁵⁸⁴ I have been able to show that in all probability it was written by the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar. (d. 962).

Finally, I have demonstrated that the attribution of the treatise in MS *Paris, Bibl. nat. ar. 309*, foll. 129r-156v,⁵⁸⁵ to an anonymous bishop of

⁵⁷⁵ Chébli, *Réfutation de Sa'id Ibn-Batriq*.

⁵⁷⁶ For this tenth-century Coptic bishop of al-Ashmūnayn in Upper Egypt, cf. Graf, *GCAL* 2, 300-317 (for *Kitāb al-majāmi'*, especially pp. 306-308); Labib, *Ibn al-Muqaffa'*; and *ISCH* 1 (1975), 165-166 (no. 12.26).

⁵⁷⁷ Sāwīrūs ibn al-Muqaffa', *Kitāb al-majāmi'*, 127-130/8.

⁵⁷⁸ Sāwīrūs ibn al-Muqaffa', *Kitāb al-majāmi'*, 222-225.

⁵⁷⁹ Cf. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. pp. 61-66 above.

⁵⁸¹ Cf. pp. 66-67 above.

⁵⁸² Cf. pp. 75-78 above.

⁵⁸³ Cf. pp. 78-79 above.

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. pp. 67-75 above.

⁵⁸⁵ Cf. pp. 79-80 above.

Kashkar is spurious, in that I have revealed that the treatise actually consists of the main part of Sāwīrūs ibn al-Muqaffa's *Kitāb al-majāmi'*.

2.5 Arguments for and against an attribution of the treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

In the following, the picture of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) which has emerged through the investigations in sections 2.2 and 2.4 above, and the texts which have been attributed to him in the same sections, will be compared with *Risāla fī tathbīt*. In this way the possibility of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of the treatise will be put to the test. First, the arguments for such an attribution will be considered. These arguments are based on both external and internal evidence. Then the arguments against such an attribution will be presented and scrutinized.

2.5.1 External arguments for Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

2.5.1.1 The *nisba* of al-Kaskarī

In the marginal note in MS *Egypt, St. Antony, Theol. 130* (= MS A), fol. 53r, the treatise is attributed to someone with the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī. Since the *nisba* indicates that the person in question has some important connection with the town of Kashkar in Iraq, the two bishops of Kashkar, both called Israel and separated in time by about a century, emerged as relevant candidates.

Usually, the two bishops are not called by any *nisba* in those references which have come down to us, but are referred to simply as bishops of Kashkar (استقف كسكر). As the only exception to this rule, it is significant that MS *Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana, Ar. 299*, which contains the report of the seance with Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and Aḥmad ibn at-Tayyib as-Sarakhsī,⁵⁸⁶ calls the ninth-century Israel by the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī.⁵⁸⁷

As far as the *nisba* is concerned, then, it is more likely that the author of the marginal note had the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar in mind than the tenth-century one.

Though in itself this argument may appear weak, it grows in importance when taken together with the other arguments for an attribution of our treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) presented in the following.

⁵⁸⁶ Cf. pp. 50-58 above.

⁵⁸⁷ MS *Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299*, fol. 149v/10.

2.5.1.2 The reputation of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) as a speculative thinker and controversialist

Though Jean-Maurice Fiey⁵⁸⁸ has alleged that the two Kashkars as controversialists, I have been able to show that this view is not consistent with the pictures we get of the two bishops from the sources at our disposal.⁵⁸⁹ In fact, the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is far more famous as a speculative thinker and a controversialist than his younger namesake whose primary fame consists in the fact that he was young, chaste, and that he could look into the future.⁵⁹⁰

There are many indications of the fame of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in this respect. That he was a learned scholar is evident from the epithet *المفسر*, "the interpreter".⁵⁹¹ His knowledge, his intelligence, and his skill in debate are stressed in the sources.⁵⁹² His ability to argue philosophically and thus confound his opponents is the main theme in the report of his debate with al-Kindī's disciple,⁵⁹³ and is corroborated by his discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā⁵⁹⁴ and the two extracts preserved in al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*.⁵⁹⁵

This general picture we have of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) as speculative thinker and a controversialist who is able to argue philosophically fits perfectly well with *Risāla fī tathbīt* which is evidently written by a philosophically trained scholar who dissolves his opponents' challenges by means of philosophical arguments.

2.5.2 Internal arguments for Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

2.5.2.1 The doctrine of divine Unity

The author of the treatise is very explicit about his doctrine of divine unity. God is one in the way a species is one, not in the way a genus or an individual is one.⁵⁹⁶

Unfortunately, the texts by Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) which have survived are very short and fragmentary, and we can of course not expect

⁵⁸⁸ Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* 3, 179.

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. pp. 49, 62 and 73 above.

⁵⁹⁰ Cf. the preceding note.

⁵⁹¹ Cf. p. 49 above, and p. 91 below.

⁵⁹² Cf. *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 81/12; 2, 73/20-74/1.

⁵⁹³ Cf. pp. 50-58 above.

⁵⁹⁴ Cf. pp. 61-66 above.

⁵⁹⁵ Cf. pp. 75-78 above.

⁵⁹⁶ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 143, 146, 151, 159, and 168. Cf. pp. 29 and 38 above.

that all his doctrines on different matters should be explicitly expressed in them. On the other hand, a careful reading of the texts which have survived may yield important information on what is implicit in these texts.

Especially relevant for our purpose is the passage which has survived from Israel's discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā, which, though the main issue is the Christological doctrine, contains information about Israel's doctrine of divine Unity and Trinity. Two things may be noted.

First, of the four categories of things enumerated by Israel⁵⁹⁷ that of "particular substance" (جوهر خاص) is applied to the hypostasis. If one were to ask which category Israel would have applied to the one and single substance of God, two of them - "accident" (عرض) and "faculty" (قوة) - could be excluded at once, since, according to Israel's definition,⁵⁹⁸ neither of the two subsists in itself. It is also clear that Israel would have excluded the category of "particular substance", since it has been reserved for the hypostasis. There remains the "general substance" (جوهر عام) which he defines, and this is the important thing, as species (نوع),⁵⁹⁹ the category according to which God is one in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

Secondly, I have already argued⁶⁰⁰ that the example given by Israel of what a hypostasis is - "like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob"⁶⁰¹ - in the first place belongs to the context of Trinitarian argument. When this is recognized, it must also be recognized that the use of this Trinitarian analogy of three human persons implies a doctrine of divine Unity according to which God is one in the way these three human persons are one, i.e. as "man" which is a species. A passage already referred to above⁶⁰² from the ninth-century Nestorian theologian 'Ammār al-Baṣrī supports this interpretation. Having advocated the Trinitarian analogy of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,⁶⁰³ which implies a divine Unity in species, 'Ammār al-Baṣrī rejects⁶⁰⁴ what according to him is a false Trinitarian analogy, viz. that of bird, lion and donkey, which would imply a divine Unity in genus.

To summarize, the implications of Israel's statement in his discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā are quite consistent with the doctrine of divine Unity as unity in species expressed in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. This is an argument in favour of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) being the author of the treatise.

⁵⁹⁷ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/7-8 (= § 3 on p. 64 above).

⁵⁹⁸ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/9-10 (= § 4 on p. 64 above).

⁵⁹⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/13 (= § 6 on p. 64 above).

⁶⁰⁰ Cf. p. 65 above.

⁶⁰¹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/15-16 (= § 7 on p. 64 above).

⁶⁰² Cf. p. 65 above.

⁶⁰³ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-masā'il*, 171/15-17.

⁶⁰⁴ 'Ammār al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-masā'il*, 171/17-21.

2.5.2.2 The Trinitarian doctrine

Though the texts associated with Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) are short and few, there are several significant parallels between the Trinitarian doctrine of these texts and the Trinitarian doctrine in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. Three passages relevant for Israel's Trinitarian doctrine are found in his discussions with Aḥmad ibn at-Tayyib as-Sarakhsī⁶⁰⁵ and with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā.⁶⁰⁶

In the first relevant passage in Israel's discussion with as-Sarakhsī,⁶⁰⁷ Israel argues that no self-subsisting thing is altered in its essence by the change of number. Though no striking parallel to this passage is found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, the underlying idea, i.e. that the substantial oneness of God is not altered by the triplification of the divine attributes, is of course also implied in this treatise.⁶⁰⁸

In Israel's discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā,⁶⁰⁹ the statement important for our purpose is that the hypostasis is defined as a "particular substance" (جوهر خاص).⁶¹⁰ This should be related to the definition of the hypostasis found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*: "a particular substance (خاص) distinguished by an inherent property which does not befit its like".⁶¹¹ The only crux here is that different terms for "substance" - جوهر and عين - are employed in the two texts. But it should be noticed that the two terms are used interchangeably to designate the one and single substance of God in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.⁶¹² Further, it cannot be excluded that the word جوهر in the expression جوهر خاص in Israel's discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā has been inserted instead of an original عين at a time when the transition from عين to جوهر as a designation of "substance" had taken root.⁶¹³

The third relevant passage is again found in Israel's encounter with as-Sarakhsī.⁶¹⁴ It is the most important passage and provides us with a series of parallels with *Risāla fī tathbīt*. As far as the Trinitarian doctrine is concerned, the three most important parallels pertain to the triad of divine attributes, the question of separations between the divine persons, and the use of Trinitarian analogies.

⁶⁰⁵ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 152v/5-153r/7 and 154v/5-156r/4.

⁶⁰⁶ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/2-18 (= pp. 63-64 above).

⁶⁰⁷ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 152v/13-153r/7.

⁶⁰⁸ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 149-150, 157-158, and 166-167.

⁶⁰⁹ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/2-18 (= pp. 63-64 above).

⁶¹⁰ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/15 (= § 7 on p. 64 above).

⁶¹¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 200 (cf. §§ 148 and 202).

⁶¹² The word عين in §§ 143, 157, 166, 203 (twice), 208, and 211 (twice); and the word جوهر e.g. in §§ 130, 150, 157, and 166.

⁶¹³ Cf. pp. 26-27 and 36 above.

⁶¹⁴ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 154v/5-156r/4.

2.5.2.2.1 The triad of divine attributes

In comparing *Risāla fī tathbīt* with the genuine works of Yahyā ibn 'Adī,⁶¹⁵ it became evident that the triad of divine attributes in this treatise, viz. being (موجود), life (حياة), and reason (نطق), is not found in Yahyā ibn 'Adī's works.

In the answer of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) to the question asked by al-Kindī's disciple, on the other hand, the same triad is met with, though the first element (being - موجود) is only tacitly understood, which is often the case in *Risāla fī tathbīt* too. Having stated⁶¹⁶ that the divine hypostases are not bodies and so neither substantial nor accidental separations apply to them, he argues for the relevance of imaginary separations.⁶¹⁷ The proof of this, he declares,⁶¹⁸ is that the living and rational (الحي الناطق) is not identical with his life (حياة) and his reason (نطق). I think there is good reason for regarding "the living and rational" as referring to God and thus constituting an instance of the triad found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, and not as a mere analogy, because the analogy of man with his being, life and reason does not appear until a few lines further down.⁶¹⁹ Even if I am wrong, I think the very use of this analogy, with these particular terms (ناطق, حي) reveals the triad of divine attributes that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) worked with, viz. the same triad as that employed in *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

2.5.2.2.2 The question of separations between the divine hypostases

In the passage quoted above, Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) answers the question of whether there are any separations (فصول) between the divine hypostases. Exactly the same question is found in *Risāla fī tathbīt* where, together with the answer, it constitutes the eleventh question and answer.⁶²⁰

A comparison of the answers in the two texts reveals several similarities. Both answers deny the existence of substantial and accidental separations between the divine hypostases,⁶²¹ on the basis that substantial and accidental separations only apply to corporeal substances, not spiritual, and to what is composite, not simple.⁶²² Since the hypostases are not

⁶¹⁵ Cf. pp. 28-29 above.

⁶¹⁶ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 155r/3-7.

⁶¹⁷ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 155r/7-9.

⁶¹⁸ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 155r/9-11.

⁶¹⁹ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 155v/2-4.

⁶²⁰ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 204-214. Cf. pp. 137-138 (no. 2.11) below.

⁶²¹ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, foll. 154v/7, 154v/13-155r/7. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 205-208.

different bodies⁶²³ or different with regard to substance,⁶²⁴ substantial separations are not relevant for the divine hypostases. And since the hypostases are not bodies,⁶²⁵ also the existence of accidental separations must be ruled out.

Instead of substantial and accidental separations, both texts advocate another kind of separations between the divine hypostases. In his debate with as-Sarakhsī, Israel of Kashkar⁶²⁶ calls these separations "estimative" or "imaginary" (وهمي). According to the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, the mind distinguishes between the hypostases by means of "estimation" or "imagination" (توهما).⁶²⁷ Both texts state that these estimative separations are such as occur between a subject (موصوف) and its attribute (صفة).⁶²⁸

To sum up, the two answers to the same question of whether there are any separations between the divine hypostases, agree both in rejecting substantial and accidental separations as well as in advocating estimative separations.

In contrast to this, it should be noted that Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī also gives an answer to the same question, but in a totally different manner. In his *Jawāb 'an masā'il*,⁶²⁹ he maintains that in one respect there are separations between the hypostases of the Trinity, while in another respect there are no separations.⁶³⁰ In what follows, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī has nothing to say about any estimative separations, though he admits that there are other kinds of alterities (غيريات) than the two categories of substantial separation and accidental separation.⁶³¹ The implications of these two categories of separations, Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī⁶³² even develops in a manner which is inconsistent with the statements in *Risāla fī tathbīt* and in Israel's

622 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 154v/14-155r/1:

...ولازمة للأجسام لا للروحانيات وللمركب لا للبسيط.

Risāla fī tathbīt, § 207:

...يشملان الجواهر الجرمية دون الجواهر الروحانية...
...ويلتحقان بالمركب دون البسيط.

623 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155r/4: أجسام مختلفة.

624 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 208: مختلفة عيناً.

625 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155r/6-7: وليست تلك الأقسام

ولا هي أجرام فيلحقها الفصول العرضية: *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 208: أجساماً فيلزمها ذلك

626 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 154v/ 8-9, 155r/7-8.

627 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 209 (cf. § 214).

628 MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 154v/10, 155r/9. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 209-214.

629 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 28/6.

630 Cf. what has been said on pp. 31-33 above about this way of reasoning which is typical of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.

631 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 30/6-31/3.

632 Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 31/3-32/6 and 32/6-35/8.

discussion with as-Sarakhsī. For instance, he denies that substantial separation necessarily implies a diversity of substances,⁶³³ and he rejects the idea that accidental separation necessarily implies corporeality.⁶³⁴

The close affinity between the answer in *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the answer given by Israel of Kashkar in his debate with as-Sarakhsī constitutes an important argument in favour of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) being the author of the treatise.

2.5.2.2.3 The Trinitarian analogies

When dealing with the question of separations between the divine hypostases, Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) adduces six Trinitarian analogies. The three divine persons and their internal relationship are compared to man with his being (ذات), his life (حياة) and his reason (نطق);⁶³⁵ to fire with its heat its light and its dryness;⁶³⁶ to water with its coldness and its dampness;⁶³⁷ to air with its heat and its dampness;⁶³⁸ to earth with its coldness and its dryness;⁶³⁹ and, finally, to the sun with its light and its rays.⁶⁴⁰

Each of these six analogies is also found in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. The analogies of man⁶⁴¹ and of the sun⁶⁴² occur in the very same context as in Israel's debate with al-Kindī's disciple, viz. in answering the question whether there are any separations between the divine hypostases. The remaining analogies of the four elements of fire, water, air, and earth, with their respective qualities, occur⁶⁴³ in another, yet similar, context, viz. in answering the question whether the affirmation of life and reason to the Creator necessitates division and partition.

Though not proving in a decisive manner that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, the occurrence of the same Trinitarian analogies in the same, or similar, contexts in the two texts is important evidence for the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being its author.

⁶³³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 31/3-32/6.

⁶³⁴ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Jawāb 'an masā'il*, 32/6-35/8.

⁶³⁵ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/2-4.

⁶³⁶ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/4-8.

⁶³⁷ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/8-9.

⁶³⁸ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/9.

⁶³⁹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/10.

⁶⁴⁰ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/10-11.

⁶⁴¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 211 (cf. § 210).

⁶⁴² *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 212.

⁶⁴³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 181.

2.5.2.3 Style and method of reasoning

Even in terms of style and method of reasoning significant parallels between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and *Risāla fī tathbīt* must be pointed out. Besides a series of general similarities in style which are due to the very genre of philosophical-theological argumentation, such as the use of conspicuous parallels, especially between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the passage in Israel's debate with as-Sarakhsī where the bishop answers the question whether there are any separations between the divine hypostases.⁶⁴⁸ This passage is written in a style very reminiscent of the style of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. To illustrate this, two important examples will be given.

First, when speaking of the divine substance, or to be exact, the first substance (الجوهر الأول), the Kashkarian bishop qualifies it as being transcendent above like: المتعالي عن النظير.⁶⁴⁹ Now, it should be noted that the divine transcendence above like and peer is a predominant theme in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, and in addition to this, the divine transcendence is expressed in formulas identical with, or very similar to, the formula quoted above.⁶⁵⁰

Secondly, I would like to draw attention to the concluding argument in the passage by the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar.⁶⁵¹ Here we find a typical arguments *a minore ad maiorem*. If these bodies - viz. man, fire, water, air, earth, and the sun⁶⁵² - which are composite have attributes which do not necessitate any substantial or accidental separations, then, so he argues, this is even more true of the creator who is transcendent. Exactly the same line of reasoning is employed by the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, not only in the context of separations,⁶⁵³ but also elsewhere.⁶⁵⁴ In addition to the fact

⁶⁴⁴ Compare *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/6 (= § 3 on p. 64 above) and MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155r/10 with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 122, 125, 130 etc. (cf. وجد in the word index).

⁶⁴⁵ Compare Cheikho, *Vingt traités*, 64/11; 65/4,8,9; 65/20 with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 96, 173, 174, and 175.

⁶⁴⁶ Compare MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 153v/9; 154r/6 with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 111, 130, and 160.

⁶⁴⁷ Compare *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/6-8 with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 86, 111, and 130..

⁶⁴⁸ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 154v/5-156r/4. Cf. p. 56 above.

⁶⁴⁹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 154v/14.

⁶⁵⁰ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 71, 121, 130, 141, 143, 146, 150, 163, 183, 189, 214, 217, and 220.

⁶⁵¹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 155v/11-156r/4.

⁶⁵² Cf. MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 155v/2-11.

⁶⁵³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 214.

⁶⁵⁴ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 180 and 183.

that the same line of reasoning is met with in the two texts, even the linguistic structure of the argument is closely parallel.

To summarize, as regards the style and the method of reasoning, there are good reasons for regarding *Risāla fī tathbīt* as having been written by the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar.

2.5.2.4 Terminology: the case of رَسِيل

I will here confine myself to a very rare, but important, vocable which occurs no less than five times in *Risāla fī tathbīt*: رَسِيل, "counterpart".⁶⁵⁵ One of the meanings of this word is "someone who is equal to you in a struggle and the like" (الموافق لك في النضال ونحوه).⁶⁵⁶ This meaning fits fairly well with the context of the treatise where the word is found parallel with قسيم,⁶⁵⁷ مثل,⁶⁵⁸ and شكل.⁶⁵⁹

The rarity of this vocable is evident from at least two facts. First, the copyist of MS B has obviously considered the original readings of MS A too difficult and has altered them to the more common words زميل⁶⁶⁰ and تزميل.⁶⁶¹ These alterations are followed by the copyists of MSS CDEF.⁶⁶² Only in § 128, have MSS BCDEF preserved the original reading of MS A - probably because the word is here written defectively as رسل instead of رَسِيل. In addition to this, a reader of MS A has had some difficulty with the word and has tried to make it more comprehensible by changing it into الترسيل. It is quite obvious that these alterations have been made after the original writing of MS A.

Secondly, the rarity of the term رَسِيل is evident from the fact that I have not been able to find it elsewhere in Christian Arabic literature⁶⁶³ - except for one single text: the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī. In this dialogue, the word رَسِيل is employed three times.⁶⁶⁴

⁶⁵⁵ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 128, 150, 183, 217, and 220.

⁶⁵⁶ *Lisān al-'arab* 11, 284. Cf. al-Fīrūzābādī, *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ* 3, 384. Cf. Dozy, *Supplément* 1, 525 ("collègue").

⁶⁵⁷ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 150.

⁶⁵⁸ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 183 (cf. §§ 128 and 217).

⁶⁵⁹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 220.

⁶⁶⁰ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 150, 183, and 217.

⁶⁶¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 220.

⁶⁶² With the exception of § 220 where MS F has preferred التزميل to الزميل.

⁶⁶³ I have not relied exclusively on my own reading, but have also consulted other people who are far more widely read in Arabic literature than I am.

⁶⁶⁴ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, foll. 155r/13, 14 and 156r/1. In the first two instances, the word has been correctly translated as "counterpart" by Matti Moosa, *A new source*, 24, but it is puzzling that he has not pointed out the rarity of the word.

The occurrence of the word رسیل, which is very rare, in these two texts is hardly a coincidence. In fact, together with the other arguments presented above, I regard the occurrence of رسیل as the strongest evidence for the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of the treatise.

2.5.3 Arguments against Israel of Kashkar (d. 872)

Having argued in favour of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of the treatise, I will now deal with three possible arguments against this assumption. To each of these arguments against the authorship of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) I will present relevant counter-evidence. As for the first two arguments, they have in fact already been dealt with earlier in this study.⁶⁶⁵ Nevertheless, it will be necessary to recall some of the results already arrived at, in order to achieve a true picture of the pros and cons in the argument concerning the authorship of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). As for the third argument, it has not been touched upon earlier. The issue in question here, however, is of extreme importance, being, as it is, closely related to the hypothesis advanced earlier in defence of an attribution of our treatise to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.⁶⁶⁶ If, after this third argument has been scrutinized, Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) still remains a candidate for the authorship of the treatise, the chances of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī being the author are greatly reduced, since the basis for the hypothesis on which Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's authorship depends will no longer exist.

2.5.3.1 Israel's alleged ignorance of Arabic

The most important text connected with Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is, beyond doubt, his dialogue with al-Kindī's disciple Aḥmad ibn at-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī.⁶⁶⁷ It is also in this dialogue that the most conspicuous parallels with *Risāla fī tathbīt* have been found.⁶⁶⁸

It has already been pointed out⁶⁶⁹ that the text of this dialogue seems to intimate that Israel was ignorant of Arabic and had to depend on an interpreter in order to communicate with his Muslim antagonist.⁶⁷⁰ If it is true that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) knew no Arabic,⁶⁷¹ this fact presents a serious argument against the ninth-century Kashkarian bishop being the

⁶⁶⁵ See pp. 49 and 52-54 above.

⁶⁶⁶ Cf. pp. 33-40 above.

⁶⁶⁷ Cf. pp. 50-58 above.

⁶⁶⁸ Cf. pp. 81-90 above.

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. pp. 52-54 above.

⁶⁷⁰ Cf. MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 151r/8-10; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/19-22(second column).

⁶⁷¹ Moosa, *A new source*, 22 (note 12), takes this for granted.

author of *Risāla fī tathbīt* which is obviously written in Arabic. There is nothing whatsoever in the treatise to indicate that it was translated from Syriac into Arabic. On the contrary, there is positive evidence that the treatise was originally written in Arabic. In § 148, the author explains the word القنوم as being a Syriac expression. Had Syriac been the original language of the treatise, this explanation would have made no sense. So, if we accept that Israel was ignorant of Arabic he may be dismissed as a possible candidate for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

But in view of the many parallels between the dialogue with as-Sarakhsī and *Risāla fī tathbīt* the allegation that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) was ignorant of Arabic is open to doubt. The arguments against Israel's ignorance of Arabic have been presented earlier in this introduction.⁶⁷² They may be summarized as follows.

1. An indication of Israel's knowledge of Arabic may be found in the epithet of "interpreter" (المفسر) given to him in *Kitāb al-majdal*.⁶⁷³ Although this epithet is ambiguous,⁶⁷⁴ one has to reckon with the possibility that Israel had made himself known as a "translator" of works from one language into another, and not merely as a "commentator". If he was a translator, I think it is more probable that he translated from Syriac into Arabic, than from Greek into Syriac. If, again, he was a translator from Syriac into Arabic, his knowledge of Arabic may be safely affirmed.

Admittedly, the interpretation of the epithet of المفسر presented here is not conclusive. In connection with the following two arguments in favour of Israel's knowledge of Arabic, it is nevertheless not without significance.

2. In the light of what we know of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) it is extremely unlikely that he should have been ignorant of Arabic. We have to remember that Israel was a high-ranking ecclesiastical dignitary, being as he was the bishop of Kashkar and finally elected catholicoi, in an area which had been under Arab dominion for more than two centuries. Moreover, he was famous for his learning and his intelligence, as well as for being an expert in debate.

As for as I can judge, the allegation that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) was ignorant of Arabic is not consistent with his personal record.

3. The context in which it is intimated that Israel knew no Arabic calls for special attention.⁶⁷⁵ An analysis of this context does not unconditionally affirm Israel's ignorance of Arabic.

The first thing to be noted is that it is nowhere expressly stated that Israel in fact lacked a knowledge of Arabic. What we are told is merely that

⁶⁷² Cf. pp. 53-54 above.

⁶⁷³ *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 73/10.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. pp. 49 and 53-54 above.

⁶⁷⁵ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 151r/4ff.; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/14ff. (second column).

when his Muslim antagonist had asked him for his *kunya*, Israel instead of giving his answer in Arabic turned to a person called Ibrāhīm who translated Israel's answer in Syriac into Arabic.

The second thing we should observe is that as-Sarakhsī's question about whose father the bishop is (i.e. what *kunya* he prefers) is regarded by the celibate bishop as a grave insult. To counter this insult, the bishop emphasizes his own Syrian identity in contrast to as-Sarakhsī's Arab identity. He expressly states that the use of the *kunya* is peculiar to the Arabs,⁶⁷⁶ and that it is a rank assumed by the Arabs, while he himself is a Syrian.⁶⁷⁷ It is appropriate in this answer that the bishop should underline his own Syrian identity by refraining from speaking Arabic, which is exactly what he does. But this should of course not be taken as evidence for Israel's ignorance of Arabic. It is rather a manifestation of the bishop's shrewdness which is the very theme of Elia's report on the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and al-Kindī's disciple.

If the arguments presented above are accepted, the allegation that the ninth-century Israel was ignorant of Arabic may be rejected, and Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) consequently remains a possible candidate for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

2.5.3.2 The authorship and the historicity of the report on the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī

Since the dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī provides us with ample evidence in favour of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, it is of vital interest to make sure that the doctrines attributed to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in the dialogue, as well as the linguistic form in which these doctrines are expressed, are actually authentic. If the dialogue proves to be inauthentic, it immediately becomes less likely that the ninth-century Israel should be the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

Unfortunately, there are at least two reasons to doubt the authenticity of what the dialogue attributes to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, viz. the authorship of the report on the dialogue and the doubtful historicity of the dialogue as such. Earlier in this introduction I have discussed both these issues.⁶⁷⁸ What follows here is largely a summary of these discussions.

As for the authorship of the report on the dialogue, it is evident from the manuscript⁶⁷⁹ that this report is attributable to a certain Elia. I have

⁶⁷⁶ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 151r/14-151v/1; Moosa, A new source, 22/28-29(second column).

⁶⁷⁷ MS Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar. 299, fol. 151v/3; Moosa, A new source, 22/32-33(second column).

⁶⁷⁸ Cf. pp. 50-51 and 57-58 above.

previously shown⁶⁸⁰ that the person intended here is Elia of Damascus, "who was called 'Alī ibn 'Ubayd ibn Dāwūd before he became a monk",⁶⁸¹ and who, after having been bishop of Jerusalem, became the metropolitan of Damascus in the middle of July 893.⁶⁸² This matter of fact could imply that not only the frame-story of the dialogue, but also the very words attributed to the two participants of the dialogue, have been composed according to the literary style and genius of Elia of Damascus. If this were true, it would be untenable to attribute *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) on the basis of parallels between this treatise and those parts of the dialogue which are uttered by the Kashkarian bishop. On the contrary, such parallels would rather point at Elia of Damascus as a likely author of the treatise. To such an assumption the following two objections may be raised.

For one thing, the use of the word *حضره* in the title of the dialogue,⁶⁸³ if my translation of this word as "on behalf of" or "by order of" holds good,⁶⁸⁴ seems to imply an approval of the report by Israel of Kashkar himself. If the report has been written by order of Israel of Kashkar, we have good reason to believe that Elia of Damascus faithfully reproduces the actual answers given by Israel during the dialogue.

For another thing, if Elia of Damascus were the real genius behind the passages attributed to Israel in the dialogue, one would expect to find parallels between these passages and other writings attributed to Elia of Damascus. The issue is complicated by the fact that it is far from clear which writings actually ought to be associated with Elia of Damascus. We have a series of names - 'Ilīyyā al-Jawharī, 'Alī ibn 'Ubayd (ibn Dāwūd), Elia of Jerusalem, Elia of Damascus, and 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Arfādī⁶⁸⁵ - which in one way or another are related to a series of writings - *Ijtimā' al-amāna*,⁶⁸⁶ *Kitāb fī ṣiḥḥat al-Injīl*,⁶⁸⁷ *Tasliyat al-aḥzān*,⁶⁸⁸ a collection

⁶⁷⁹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 149v/9,11-12; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/2,5-7(first column).

⁶⁸⁰ Pp. 50-51 above.

⁶⁸¹ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 149v/12; Moosa, *A new source*, 22/6-7(first column).

⁶⁸² *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 80/16-17.

⁶⁸³ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana* Ar. 299, fol. 149v/10.

⁶⁸⁴ Cf. p. 51 above.

⁶⁸⁵ For references, cf. Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 513-516; Graf, *GCAL* 2, 132-134; *ISCH* 2 (1976), 237; Levi della Vida, *Il conforto*, 346-347; Troupeau, *Le livre de l'unanimité*, 198-199; and Fiey, *Les insaisissable nestoriens*, *passim*.

⁶⁸⁶ Ed. Troupeau, *Le livre de l'unanimité*, 201-219 (with French translation).

⁶⁸⁷ No longer extant, this book is mentioned in 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Arfādī, *Ijtimā' al-amāna*, 217/2 (§ 9).

⁶⁸⁸ Ed. Levi della Vida, *Il conforto*, 353-374 (374-397, Italian translation).

of canons,⁶⁸⁹ and an explanation of the symbol of Nicea.⁶⁹⁰

According to Joseph Simonius Assemani,⁶⁹¹ whose opinion is followed by Georg Graf,⁶⁹² both the collection of canons and *Ijtimā' al-amāna* are attributable to ʿIliyyā al-Jawharī (alias Ibn 'Ubayd, alias Elia of Jerusalem, alias Elia of Damascus), who was the Nestorian bishop of Jerusalem, 893 when he became the metropolitan of Damascus.

On the other hand, Gérard Troupeau,⁶⁹³ and with him Khalil Samir,⁶⁹⁴ only attributes the collection of canons to the above-mentioned ʿIliyyā al-Jawharī, while *Ijtimā' al-amāna* is regarded as having been written by a certain 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Arfādī, presumably a Jacobite of the eleventh century.

Yet another view is held by Jean Maurice Fiey,⁶⁹⁵ who takes the attribution of *Ijtimā' al-amāna* to ʿIliyyā al-Jawharī⁶⁹⁶ for granted, but attributes the collection of canons to a hitherto unknown Elia, metropolitan of Damascus, who is supposed to have lived towards the end of the tenth century.

The other works, *Tasliyat al-aḥzān* and the explanation of the symbol of Nicea may safely be attributed to Elia of Damascus, alias 'Alī ibn 'Ubayd, who became the metropolitan of Damascus in 893,⁶⁹⁷ while *Kitāb fī ṣiḥḥat al-Injīl* was written by the author of *Ijtimā' al-amāna*, who is either the same Elia of Damascus, or an eleventh-century 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Arfādī.

It is not one of my tasks, here, to pass judgment on the true identity of the names mentioned above, nor to decide the authorship of the works connected with these names. For our purpose, it is sufficient to observe that none of the works connected with Elia of Damascus which have come down to us show any resemblance in form or content to the report on the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī. Consequently, there is no positive evidence for the hypothesis that the passages attributed to the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar in the dialogue with as-Sarakhsī should actually be attributed to Elia of Damascus.

Turning to the historicity of the dialogue, it has to be admitted that it is

689 MS Vat. ar. 157, foll. 2v-81v.

690 Only known through Sāwirus ibn al-Muqaffa', *al-Kitāb ath-thānī*.

691 Assemani, *Bibl. or.* 3:1, 513-516.

692 Graf, *GICAL* 2, 132.

693 Troupeau, *Le livre de l'unanimité*, 198-199.

694 *ISCH* 2 (1976), 237.

695 Fiey, *Les insaisissables nestoriens*, 173-176.

696 He does not, however, identify this ʿIliyyā al-Jawharī with 'Alī ibn 'Ubayd who became metropolitan in 893.

697 For *Tasliyat al-aḥzān*, cf. Levi della Vida, *Il conforto*, 346-347, and Troupeau, *Le livre de l'unanimité*, 198. For the explanation of the symbol of Nicea, cf. Graf, *GICAL* 2, 134-135, and Fiey, *Les insaisissables nestoriens*, 174.

possible to argue that the report on the dialogue as it has come down to us is a literary fiction. The highly idealized picture of the bishop and the sound defeat of as-Sarakhsī, who is silenced and has to leave the place in shame at the end, are features typical of the genre of fictitious dialogues.⁶⁹⁸ And though the victory of Israel does not result in any material reward, which is sometimes the outcome of fictitious dialogues presumably composed in support of endangered rights,⁶⁹⁹ I have suggested⁷⁰⁰ another *Sitz im Leben* for the present dialogue which explains the historically suspect features of the dialogue.

But even if it is admitted that the dialogue in its present form represents a literary genre whose function is by no means confined to being a mere report of a historical event, I think it is important not to confuse, on the one hand, the question of whether a dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī ever took place and whether the bishop ever said what the report claims that he said, and on the other, the question of the function and literary genre of the report on the dialogue in its present form. In other words, if the frame-story has features which are virtually unhistorical, this does not automatically mean that the dialogue as such and the words attributed to the two participants of the dialogue are unhistorical too.

In fact, there seems to have been a tendency in Christian Arabic literature in the Middle Ages to use already existing dialogues and to expand them and change them, in order to make them serve a particular purpose. Georg Graf⁷⁰¹ mentions this possibility in connection with the genre of dialogues, and the two recensions of the dialogue of Abraham of Tiberias are a good example of this process.⁷⁰²

With regard to the report on the dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsī, it is quite conceivable that a dialogue between the two really took place and that the words attributed to them in this report are virtually authentic quotations from what was said during the dialogue. In the present context of the frame-story of Elia of Damascus, the function of these quotations is, I presume, not primarily that of simply recording what was said in the course of the dialogue; instead, they are subordinated to the superior function of the present form of the dialogue. We do not know for sure what this superior function was. I have suggested⁷⁰³ as a possibility that the present form of the dialogue may have functioned as a propaganda pamphlet in support of Israel as a patriarchal candidate against his rival Enosh.

⁶⁹⁸ Cf. pp. 57-58 above where I have referred to Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 831-833.

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. p. 58 above.

⁷⁰⁰ Cf. p. 58 above.

⁷⁰¹ Graf, *Christliche Polemik*, 832.

⁷⁰² Cf. Marcuzzo, *Le dialogue d'Abraham de Tibériade*, 101, 200-208.

⁷⁰³ Cf. p. 58 above.

If this suggestion holds good, the present version of the dialogue was written and exerted its function not very long after the real dialogue was held and during the lifetime of Israel himself. This proximity in time between the actual dialogue and the present report could be regarded as a guarantee for the authenticity of the words attributed to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in the report of the dialogue.

To sum up, neither the authorship of the report, nor the possible doubts about the historicity of the dialogue, are able to invalidate the assumption that the words attributed to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in the report of the dialogue are authentic. If these words are authentic, the parallels found between them and *Risāla fī tathbīt* may still be regarded as unchallenged arguments for the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of the treatise.

2.5.3.3 A chronological argument

I now turn to the final and, perhaps, most significant argument against the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. This argument is a chronological one, based on a passage in *Risāla fī tathbīt* which, at first sight, cannot have been written before the tenth century, or approximately half a century after the death of Israel. The passage in question is the one where a certain an-Nāshi' is refuted.⁷⁰⁴ Given the subject-matter of this refutation, i.e. the relation between God and the creation, and the rules of contradiction, it is quite clear that the person intended is the Mu'tazilite theologian an-Nāshi' al-Akbar.⁷⁰⁵

The chronological problem of Israel of Kashkar, who died in old age in 872, referring in the past tense⁷⁰⁶ to an-Nāshi' al-Akbar, who died in 906,⁷⁰⁷ is evident. Consequently, if we want to maintain that the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar is the author of the treatise, this chronological problem has to be solved. As it is, two different solutions may be offered.

The first solution would be to regard the passage refuting an-Nāshi' as a later interpolation into the original text of the treatise. But to consider a passage an interpolation is a serious matter and can only be done if there are weighty arguments for doing so. As a matter of fact, it is possible to adduce arguments against §§ 102-118 being an integral part of the treatise. A look at the arrangement of the treatise shows that the refutation of an-Nāshi' is found at the end of a clearly defined section which I have called "Part Two" (§§ 58-118)⁷⁰⁸ and which deals with the different non-Christian doctrines of the one. Immediately after this second part of the treatise, a likewise

⁷⁰⁴ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 102-118. Cf. pp. 34-35 above.

⁷⁰⁵ For an-Nāshi' al-Akbar, cf. van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, passim.

⁷⁰⁶ Cf. the verb *نفي* in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 102.

⁷⁰⁷ Cf. van Ess, *Frühe Mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 1 (with biographical references).

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. the outline of the treatise on pp. 132-133 below.

clearly defined section begins. This final and crucial section of the treatise, which expounds the Christian doctrine of divine Unity, I have called "Part Three" (§§ 119-220).⁷⁰⁹

Concentrating on "Part Two" (§§ 58-118), we may observe that this part starts with an exposition of the ways in which "one" may be said (§§ 59-62), whereupon follows a heresiographical exposition which begins with § 63 and runs smoothly all the way through § 97. Then, in §§ 98-101, the heresiographical exposition is discontinued by a recapitulation of the ways in which "one" may be said.⁷¹⁰ If "Part Two" had ended with §§ 98-101, the two passages expounding the ways in which "one" may be said could be regarded as an example of an *inclusio* which marks the beginning and the end of a section, in this case the heresiographical outline of the different doctrines of the one. As it is, however, the recapitulation of the ways in which "one" may be said in §§ 98-101 is immediately followed by the refutation of an-Nāshi' in §§ 102-118. When we look at the outline of the treatise in this way, the refutation of an-Nāshi' actually gives the impression of being an appendix to "Part Two". If §§ 102-118 are an appendix to "Part Two", this appendix may very well have been added by another person than the original author of the treatise. If this is the case, the original problem raised by §§ 102-118 may be regarded as solved.

But, on the other hand, if the refutation of an-Nāshi' is a later addition, as the structure of the treatise seems to suggest, we ought to be able to detect a stylistic discontinuity in §§ 102-118 when compared with the rest of the treatise. Unfortunately, a comparison of the style and vocabulary of §§ 102-118 with the style and vocabulary of the remaining parts of the treatise does not support the hypothesis of §§ 102-118 being a later addition. On the contrary: the refutation of an-Nāshi' is quite consistent with the rest of the treatise, both with regard to style and vocabulary, as well as with regard to doctrine. A few examples of this consistency may suffice.

The expression القسمة العقلية, which appears twice⁷¹¹ in the section refuting an-Nāshi', is also found three times⁷¹² elsewhere in the treatise. The parallel expressions حكم القياس⁷¹³ and حكم الكلام⁷¹⁴ are found in §§ 102-118 as well as elsewhere. The formulas فأتى من ذلك بأشنع المحال⁷¹⁵ in § 104, and وهذا أشنع قانون المحال in § 118, have several parallels in other parts of the treatise.

As for the doctrinal consistency, the main issue in question in §§ 102-

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. the outline of the treatise on pp. 134-138 below.

⁷¹⁰ Cf. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 59-62.

⁷¹¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 107 and 114.

⁷¹² *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 155, 160, and 172.

⁷¹³ It occurs in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 114, as well as in §§ 66, 82, 123 (القياس وحكمه), and 129.

⁷¹⁴ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 112, as well as in § 155.

⁷¹⁵ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 26, 69, 72, 79, and 93.

118, i.e. the relation between God and the creation, fits quite well into the doctrinal discussions of the treatise as a whole. For instance, the question of participation (اشتراك) and correspondence (تناسب), both terms occurring in § 102, is also dealt with explicitly in §§ 124-129.

To summarize: while the structure and the composition of the treatise seem to suggest that §§ 102-118 have been added after its original composition, the style and the vocabulary, as well as the doctrine, do not support a theory of an interpolation. If the refutation of an-Nāshī' in §§ 102-118 nonetheless is a later interpolation, it must have been done by someone who really had the ability to assimilate the style and purport of the treatise as a whole. Perhaps a disciple of the author of the treatise?

I now come to the second solution to the chronological problem of §§ 102-118. According to this solution, the refutation of an-Nāshī' was nevertheless written by the original author of the treatise, supposedly by Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). In order to maintain this, we have to assume that the Mu'tazilite an-Nāshī' al-Akbar was active and renowned for his doctrine already during the lifetime of Israel of Kashkar, i.e. before 872.

Unfortunately, we do not know when an-Nāshī' started his career. Although the sources agree about the year of his death (293 A.H./906 A.D.), they do not give us any clue as to the date of his birth.⁷¹⁶ We know that he lived in Baghdad for a long time, but that he left Iraq after 892, and spent the rest of his life in Egypt.⁷¹⁷ What we have to look for is some kind of reference to theological or philosophical activity before 872, the year of Israel's death. In fact, it is possible to find indications of such work. Among those who were subjected to an-Nāshī' 's severe critique, we have the famous philosopher al-Kindī. According to Josef van Ess⁷¹⁸ on whose opinion I depend in this matter, al-Kindī seems still to have been alive when an-Nāshī' polemicized against him. If this is true, we have here an indication of polemical activity on the part of an-Nāshī' well before 872, given the fact that al-Kindī died shortly after 870.⁷¹⁹ Further, if an-Nāshī' was active as a polemicist well before 872, it is quite conceivable that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) may have refuted him in *Risāla fī tathbīt*. Consequently, the chronological problem raised by §§ 102-118 may be regarded as solved.

As far as the perfect form of the verb *نفي* in § 102 is concerned, I do not think this constitutes a problem. It is quite possible to regard the perfect of the verb as signifying what "has been already completed and remains in a state of completion",⁷²⁰ rather than having the significance of the preterite

⁷¹⁶ Cf. van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 1 (with references to the sources).

⁷¹⁷ Cf. van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 1.

⁷¹⁸ van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 4.

⁷¹⁹ Cf. van Ess, *Frühe mu'tazilitische Häresiographie*, 4 ("kurz nach 256/870 gestorben"); Ivry, *al-Kindī's Metaphysics*, 3 ("died in Baghdad about A.D. 870"). Jolivet-Rashed, *al-Kindī*, 122, gives 252/866 as the date of al-Kindī's death.

tense. It should be noted that the author also uses the perfect form of the verb when referring to the Mu'tazilites⁷²¹ and the Muslims⁷²² who were very much alive when the treatise was composed.

With two solutions to the chronological problem of §§ 102-118 in mind, one may wonder which is the more plausible solution. But, as a matter of fact, the two solutions are not strictly alternatives. The theory of §§ 102-118 representing an interpolation made after the original composition of the treatise does not necessarily exclude the possibility of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) being the author of the refutation of an-Nāshi' as well as of the entire treatise. It is quite plausible, I think, that Israel himself added the passage refuting an-Nāshi' to his own treatise. Such a theory explains why §§ 102-118 seem to be a later addition when the outline of the treatise is considered, while at the same time the passage is quite consistent with the rest of the treatise with regard to style, vocabulary and doctrine.

2.5.4 Summary

Having gone through the arguments for and against an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), the following may be said by way of summary.

Besides the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī⁷²³ by which Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is designated in MS *Florence, Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana*, Ar. 299, fol. 149v/10, and which fits in perfectly with the marginal note in MS *Egypt, St. Antony, Theol. 130* (= MS A), fol. 53r/marg., where the treatise is attributed to someone with the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī, and besides the reputation of the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar as a speculative thinker and a controversialist,⁷²⁴ which more than well qualifies him for the authorship of the treatise, a series of positive internal arguments for an attribution to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) have been offered.⁷²⁵

By comparing *Risāla fī tathbīt* with the passages attributed to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) in the dialogue between him and as-Sarakhsī which has been reported by Elia of Damascus,⁷²⁶ as well as with the discussion between Israel and Qusṭā ibn Lūqā, incorrectly associated with the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar,⁷²⁷ and the extracts in Chapter six of al-Mu'taman ibn al-'Assāl's *Majmū' uṣūl ad-dīn*, both doctrinal⁷²⁸ and stylistic⁷²⁹

⁷²⁰ Wright, *Grammar* 2, 1 (§ 1b). Cf. Fischer, *Grammatik*, 91 (§ 181b).

⁷²¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 84.

⁷²² *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 97.

⁷²³ Cf. p. 81 above.

⁷²⁴ Cf. p. 82 above.

⁷²⁵ Cf. pp. 82-90 above.

⁷²⁶ Cf. pp. 50-58 above.

⁷²⁷ Cf. pp. 61-66 above.

parallels have been revealed.

In addition to these doctrinal and stylistic parallels, a most significant terminological link has been shown to exist between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and *Risāla fī tathbīt*.⁷³⁰ The occurrence of the extremely rare vocable رسييل in *Risāla fī tathbīt* as well as in the dialogue between Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and as-Sarakhsī can hardly be regarded as a coincidence. If we add to this the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī,⁷³¹ which also constitutes a strong link between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the dialogue of Israel and as-Sarakhsī, the possibility of a coincidence must be ruled out.

In spite of all the arguments in favour of an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), I have also considered possible arguments against such an attribution.⁷³² Although these latter arguments may at first seem plausible, I have been able to produce convincing counter-evidence in each case.⁷³³

Having come so far in the investigation of the question of the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, it must be admitted that Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is a very serious candidate for the authorship. Before passing final judgment, though, the chances of the later Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) must be considered.

2.6 Arguments for and against an attribution of the treatise to Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)

When taking into consideration the possibility of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, we have to rely on two sources; first, the picture of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) which has been gained from *Kitāb al-majdal*,⁷³⁴ and, secondly, his refutation of the Jews.⁷³⁵ Comparing *Risāla fī tathbīt* with these two sources, I will present a possible argument in favour of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962), and then I will develop the arguments against him.

2.6.1 A possible argument for Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)

Although the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt* criticizes and ridicules an-Nāshi' al-Akbar's rejection of any correspondence or participation with

⁷²⁸ Cf. pp. 82-87 above.

⁷²⁹ Cf. pp. 88-89 above.

⁷³⁰ Cf. pp. 89-90 above.

⁷³¹ Cf. p. 81 above.

⁷³² Cf. pp. 90-99 above.

⁷³³ Cf. pp. 91-92, 93-96. and 96-99 above.

⁷³⁴ *Kitāb al-majdal* I, 98/16-99/16; 2, 91/7-93/6. Cf. pp. 58-61 above.

⁷³⁵ Cf. pp. 67-75 above.

regard to the Creator and his creatures (§§ 102-118), he is far from advocating a doctrine of a univocity of being. Rather, he strongly rejects the anthropomorphism of Hishām ibn al-Hakam (§§ 90-93). In fact, the transcendence of God is a theme which is stressed throughout the treatise.⁷³⁶

In his refutation of the Jews,⁷³⁷ Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) rejects an anthropomorphic concept of God of which he accuses the Jews by referring to passages in the Book of Daniel⁷³⁸ and the Book of Amos⁷³⁹ where God is pictured in an anthropomorphic way.

The fact that anthropomorphism is rejected both in the refutation of the Jews by Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) as well as in *Risāla fī tathbīt* could be regarded as an indication of a common authorship for the two works.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the rejection of anthropomorphism is far too common to allow of any definite conclusions in this respect. In addition to this, the way in which anthropomorphism is rejected in the two texts exhibits no formal parallels.

2.6.2 Arguments against Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)

While it is difficult to argue for an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar, it is fairly easy to find arguments against such an attribution. In the following some of these arguments will be presented.

2.6.2.1 The absence of the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī

In the marginal note in MS A, fol. 53r, the treatise is attributed to someone designated by the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī. In the case of the older Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), we have evidence for the use of this *nisba*.⁷⁴⁰ With regard to the younger Israel of Kashkar (d. 962), there is no positive evidence that he was ever called by the adjectival name of al-Kaskarī.

If the few sources we have at our disposal reflect a true difference in the designations of the two Kashkarian bishops, there is good reason not to associate the al-Kaskarī of the marginal note in MS A with Israel of Kashkar (d. 962).

⁷³⁶ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 20, 42, 54, 71, 121, 130, 141, 143, 146, 150, 163, 189, 214, 217, 220.

⁷³⁷ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 80v/1-10.

⁷³⁸ Dan. 7:9.

⁷³⁹ Am. 7:7 (?).

⁷⁴⁰ MS Florence, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurenziana Ar.* 299, fol. 149v/10, 14. Cf. p. 81 above.

2.6.2.2 The non-philosophical character of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962)

As has already been pointed out earlier in this introduction,⁷⁴¹ the main characteristics of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) seem to have been piety, chastity, asceticism, and the ability to divine future events. Although he was a teacher in the school of Mār Mārī at Dayr Qunnā,⁷⁴² which could boast a famous logician like Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus,⁷⁴³ there is no evidence of any philosophical or speculative activity in the career of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962). The non-philosophical impression we get of the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar in the account of *Kitāb al-majdal*⁷⁴⁴ is corroborated by the refutation of the Jews. The impression we get of the author of this refutation is not that of a speculative philosopher, but rather that of an impatient assailant⁷⁴⁵ who at the same time exhibits signs of having been a practical diplomat.⁷⁴⁶

It is quite clear that *Risāla fī tathbīt* has been written by an author with a distinct interest in philosophical, theological and speculative matters. Consequently, it is difficult to imagine Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) as the author of the treatise.

2.6.2.3 Stylistic differences

When comparing the refutation of the Jews by Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) with *Risāla fī tathbīt*, it is impossible to detect any significant parallels with regard to style or vocabulary. Even if certain expressions⁷⁴⁷ are common to the two texts, the general stylistic character of the two works is quite different.

While *Risāla fī tathbīt* abounds in philosophical terms and elaborate arguments, the vocabulary of the refutation of the Jews is more practical and the arguments less refined. A very common feature in *Risāla fī tathbīt* is the appeal to the "rules of language" and the like: *حكم الكلام*,⁷⁴⁸ *قانون*

⁷⁴¹ Cf. what has been said on pp. 60 (with notes 391-394), 62 (with note 416), 67 (note 455), 73 (with note 516) above.

⁷⁴² *Kitāb al-majdal* 1, 98/16; 2, 91/8. Cf. p. 58 above.

⁷⁴³ Cf. p. 59 (with note 378) above.

⁷⁴⁴ It should be remembered that the discussion with Qusṭā ibn Lūqā which *Kitāb al-majdal* 2, 92/18, attributes to the tenth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) actually ought to be put in connection with the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar (d. 872). Cf. pp. 61-66 above.

⁷⁴⁵ Cf. p. 71 above.

⁷⁴⁶ Cf. pp. 73-74 above.

⁷⁴⁷ E.g. *وجملة القول أنه إن* (MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 80r/8) and *وجملة ما اقول أنه إن* (*Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 96); and *ألا ترى* (*Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 134, 210, 218; cf. MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, foll. 103r/3 and 120r/4).

قوانين⁷⁵² قانون المنطق⁷⁵¹ معاني الكلام⁷⁵⁰ قوانين الكلام⁷⁴⁹ الكلام⁷⁴⁸
 القياس⁷⁵⁶ حكم القياس⁷⁵⁵ دلائل القياس⁷⁵⁴ برهان منطقي⁷⁵³ المنطق⁷⁵²
 القسمة and⁷⁵⁹ أعلام القياس وأدلته⁷⁵⁸ شواهد القياس⁷⁵⁷ وحكيه⁷⁶⁰
 Such expressions do not occur in the refutation of the Jews, in spite of the fact that the refutation is allegedly based on "reason and tradition" (العقل والنقل).⁷⁶¹

In part, the stylistic differences pointed out here may be due to the difference in subject-matter between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the refutation of the Jews. But even if we take into account that the work of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) is solely composed in order to refute the Jews, while *Risāla fī tathbīt* deals with the speculative question of divine Unity and Trinity, the fundamental stylistic dissimilarity of the two texts remains conspicuous. As a result, it is improbable that Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) is the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

2.6.2.4 A doctrinal discrepancy: the triads of divine attributes

When discussing the possibility of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī being the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, we were able to observe a discrepancy with regard to the triads of divine attributes.⁷⁶² The absence of the present treatise's triad of 'Adī, where instead two other triads predominate,⁷⁶³ in the works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī, is a weighty argument against an attribution of *Risāla fī tathbīt* to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.

Although the refutation of the Jews by Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) is actually not concerned with the question of divine Unity and Trinity, the

⁷⁴⁸ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 112 and 155.

⁷⁴⁹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 9 and 163.

⁷⁵⁰ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 120.

⁷⁵¹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 162 and 201.

⁷⁵² *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 66.

⁷⁵³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 166.

⁷⁵⁴ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 120.

⁷⁵⁵ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 9, 81, 92, 213, and 214.

⁷⁵⁶ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 61, 82, 114, 129, and 170.

⁷⁵⁷ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 123.

⁷⁵⁸ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 120.

⁷⁵⁹ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, § 121.

⁷⁶⁰ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 107, 114, 155, 160, and 172.

⁷⁶¹ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 62r/5.

⁷⁶² Cf. pp. 28-29 above.

⁷⁶³ E.g. *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 153-155.

⁷⁶⁴ Cf. pp. 28 and 29 above.

author nevertheless incidentally refers to the Trinity by means of a triad. This is of great importance for our purpose, because it provides us with a useful point of reference when comparing the refutation of the Jews with *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

According to the relevant passage in the refutation of the Jews, the activities of God show "that he is living and knowing, i.e. possessing word and spirit, and that he and his word and his spirit are three hypostases" (أنه حي عالم اي ذو كلمة وروح وأنه وكلمته وروحه ثلاثة أقانيم).⁷⁶⁵ As we see, the triad used here by Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) is that of dialogue between Timothy I and the caliph al-Mahdī,⁷⁶⁶ but not in the *fī tathbīt*.

Being as it is the only reference to a divine triad attributable to Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) we should perhaps not pay too much attention to it. In the case of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī in whose works the references to divine triads are much more common,⁷⁶⁷ the discrepancy is, admittedly, of a more significant nature.

Nevertheless, the difference found here between Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) and *Risāla fī tathbīt* is far from negligible, and, taken with the other arguments presented above, it adds to our impression that *Risāla fī tathbīt* cannot be the product of Israel of Kashkar (d. 962).

3 Summary of the question of the authorship of the treatise

In the title of *Risāla fī tathbīt* (§ 2), the philosopher Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī (d. 974) is explicitly mentioned as the author. But since the basic MS A, in a marginal note, disclaims Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī's authorship of the treatise, it has been necessary to put the authenticity of the traditional attribution to a severe test.

As a first step, I disregarded the marginal note with its reference to al-Kaskarī and concentrated on a comparison between *Risāla fī tathbīt* and the indisputably genuine works of Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.⁷⁶⁸ Having made a list of arguments for an attribution to Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī⁷⁶⁹ and a corresponding list of arguments against such an attribution,⁷⁷⁰ it had to be admitted⁷⁷¹ that the arguments against Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī were more significant than those in his

⁷⁶⁵ MS Cairo, *Copt. Patr. Hist.* 61, fol. 84r/4-5.

⁷⁶⁶ Timothy I, *Muḥāwara*, 129/9-10.

⁷⁶⁷ Cf. pp. 28-29 above.

⁷⁶⁸ Cf. pp. 17-41 above.

⁷⁶⁹ Cf. pp. 21-25 above.

⁷⁷⁰ Cf. pp. 25-33 above.

⁷⁷¹ Cf. p. 33 above.

favour.

Instead of leaving the matter at that, I ventured to defend the traditional attribution by assuming as a hypothesis that the treatise was, nevertheless, written by Yahyā ibn 'Adī, but at a very early stage of his career, long before the appearance of his mature works.⁷⁷² The basis for this hypothesis was the correlation of the passage in *Risāla fī tathbīt*, where an-Nāshi' al-Akbar is refuted,⁷⁷³ with a biographical remark made by aṣ-Ṣafī ibn al-'Assāl⁷⁷⁴ and according to which Yahyā ibn 'Adī in 923, at the age of about thirty, was busy copying an-Nāshi' 's *al-Kitāb al-awsaṭ* and presumably mentally preoccupied with an-Nāshi' 's thought. By means of this hypothesis, some of the arguments against Yahyā ibn 'Adī 's authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt* were neutralized.⁷⁷⁵ At that point, it was still impossible to make a final decision on the question of authorship without taking into consideration the reference to al-Kaskarī in the marginal note of MS A.

The investigation of the reference to al-Kaskarī was the second step to be taken. This investigation proved to be a complicated one. In the search for relevant candidates known by the *nisba* of al-Kaskarī or in some way or other connected with the town of Kashkar, a series of names could be listed.⁷⁷⁶ Some of these names could be dismissed at once, while others were left out only after due consideration. As the most serious candidate for the authorship of *Risāla fī tathbīt*, two Kaskarian bishops, both called Israel of Kashkar but separated by a century, called for special attention.

Due to the fact that these two bishops of Kashkar have been confused with one another from early times, a confusion which modern scholars have not been able to remedy since no one has previously given the problem enough attention, I had to go through all the available sources, in order to obtain a fairly distinct picture of each of the two Kashkarian bishops.⁷⁷⁷

This done, the two bishops of Kashkar could be confronted with *Risāla fī tathbīt*.⁷⁷⁸ One result of this confrontation is quite clear. Of the two namesakes, the earlier Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is by far the most serious candidate as the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*. Very little points towards the younger Israel of Kashkar (d. 962) being the author of the treatise.⁷⁷⁹

As for the older ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, alias Isrā'īl al-Kaskarī,⁷⁸⁰ a considerable number of arguments were advanced in favour

⁷⁷² Cf. pp. 33-40 above.

⁷⁷³ *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 102-118.

⁷⁷⁴ Cf. p. 34 above.

⁷⁷⁵ Cf. pp. 35-40 above.

⁷⁷⁶ Cf. pp. 43-48 above.

⁷⁷⁷ Cf. pp. 48-81 above.

⁷⁷⁸ Cf. pp. 81-104 above.

⁷⁷⁹ Cf. pp. 100-104 above.

⁷⁸⁰ Cf. pp. 81-90 above.

of his being the author of the treatise, in spite of the scarcity of sources.⁷⁸¹ In addition to this, the arguments against Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) were all of such a nature that counter-evidence could be found.⁷⁸²

In dealing with one of these arguments⁷⁸³ against the ninth-century Israel of Kashkar, the discussion focused on the passage refuting an-Nāshi',⁷⁸⁴ i.e. the passage crucial to the hypothesis of *Risāla fī tathbīt* being an early piece of work by Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī.⁷⁸⁵ Here it became clear that this very passage is probably a later addition to the original treatise, most likely written and added by the author himself it is true, but nonetheless an addition.

With this fact in mind, it must be admitted that the basis for the hypothesis of *Risāla fī tathbīt* being an early piece of work by Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī becomes much less convincing. As a result, we again have to admit that the arguments against Yaḥyā ibn 'Adī being the author of the treatise by far outweigh the arguments in favour of such an attribution.⁷⁸⁶

In the case of Israel of Kashkar (d. 872), on the other hand, we have many positive arguments in favour of his being the author and no binding argument against.⁷⁸⁷ Consequently, it is now possible to establish that, in all probability, the ninth-century Nestorian Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) is the author of *Risāla fī tathbīt*.

781 Cf. p. 84 above.

782 Cf. pp. 90-99 above.

783 Cf. pp. 96-99 above.

784 *Risāla fī tathbīt*, §§ 102-118.

785 Cf. pp. 33-40 above.

786 Cf. p. 33 above.

787 Cf. pp. 81-100 above.

Chapter Two: A description of the manuscripts, and the principles of edition, and the outline of the treatise

1 A description of the manuscripts

1.1 MS A (= I)

1.1.1 General features

This manuscript belongs to the Monastery of St. Antony by the Red Sea and is listed as Theol. no. 130 in the typewritten catalogue of Yassā Afandī 'Abd al-Masīḥ.¹ It has never before been the object of scholarly research.

The manuscript consists of 197 folios with 25 lines to the page, and it measures 31 x 19 cm. On fol. 2r-v, according to the cursive Coptic foliotation, the table of contents for the whole volume is found.

The manuscript is in rather bad condition. The folios are worn and in certain places eaten by worms. Large pieces of the last folio (197) have fallen away. The ink has faded considerably, but without endangering the legibility of the text.

At least twice a whole page has been left blank by the copyist,² and on several occasions in treatise no. 32 - the controversy with al-Miṣrī³ - a couple of lines, or more, have been left blank.⁴ Once such a blank has been commented on in the margin in the words *بقي جميع جواب المصري* ("the whole of al-Miṣrī's answer is missing").⁵

The most common mark of punctuation is the dotted circle. It is used rather infrequently, except in the case of an enumeration of a series of names, when the dotted circle is employed after each name.⁶ Subtitles, like *القول في الواحد*,⁷ or such words as *وقال*,⁸ are often enclosed between signs of four dotted circles (⋄⋄). This sign also appears as four hooks (⋄⋄).⁹ Instead of the small dotted circle, a large black circle is occasionally employed as a mark of punctuation. Sometimes this mark

¹ Yassā Afandī 'Abd al-Masīḥ, *Katāḏij*, no. 130 (*lāhūt*).

² MS A, foll. 104r (between treatises nos. 29 and 30) and 192r (between treatises nos. 32 and 33).

³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḡalālat an-naṣṭūriyya*.

⁴ E.g. MS A, fol. 160r.

⁵ MS A, fol. 176v.

⁶ For instance when the signs of the zodiac are enumerated on fol. 54r/18-19 (§ 31).

⁷ MS A, fol. 55v/10 (§ 58).

⁸ E.g. MS A, fol. 56r/16 (§ 70).

⁹ MS A, fol. 53v/8 (enclosing the words *القول في التوحيد* in § 15).

resembles an inverted heart.¹⁰

At the bottom of the verso pages, unfortunately no catchwords are found which enable one to decide whether any folios are missing. As far as *Risāla fī tathbīt* is concerned, however, I have not discovered any missing folio.

1.1.2 Date, copyist, descendance

We do not know when the copyist finished his work, but an *ante quem* may be found on fol. 197r, where it is stated that the collation of the manuscript was completed in the month of Kiyahk 1287 A.M. (= 27th of November-26th of December A.D. 1570). Presumably the manuscript was written in the same year. At the end of treatise no. 28,¹¹ the words *بلغ مقابلة* indicate where the copyist has made a halt in his collation of the MS.

The name of the copyist is not mentioned in the manuscript, and our knowledge of the manuscript tradition prior to MS A is confined to a note¹² at the beginning of treatise no. 31 - the controversy with Quryāqus:¹³

وهذا كتبتُه من نسخة أولها ما هذه حكايته:
وجدتُ بمصر في المحرم سنة هذا الكتاب بخط
الفيلسوف أبي الخير الحسن ابن سوار بن بانا
ابن بهنام تلميذ أبي زكريا نسخه من خط شيخه
وقراه عليه في المحرم سنة ٤٤٣.

"This is what I transcribed from a copy which begins with this narrative: In Muḥarram 474 [A.H.],¹⁴ in Cairo, I found this book in the handwriting of the philosopher Abū l-Khayr al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār ibn Bānā ibn Bahnām,¹⁵ the disciple of Abū Zakariyyā.¹⁶ He copied it from [a manuscript in] the handwriting of his master, and he read it to him in Muḥarram 355 [A.H.]."¹⁷

¹⁰ E.g. MS A, fol. 53v/7 (at the end of § 14).

¹¹ MS A, fol. 86v/ult.

¹² MS A, fol. 105r. This note has been edited by Emilio Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 5⁺ (note), 136 (note: transl.). Cf. also Platti, *La grande polémique I*, VII. A translation may also be found in Graf, *Catalogue*, 234.

¹³ Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Munāqada li-Quryāqus*.

¹⁴ I.e. June 11- July 10, A.D. 1081.

¹⁵ For al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār, cf. Endress, *Works*, 8-9, with references.

¹⁶ I.e. Yahyā ibn 'Adī.

¹⁷ I.e. December 28, A.D. 965 - January 27, A.D. 966.

Platti¹⁸ has drawn attention to the fact that Yahyā ibn 'Adī cannot have written¹⁹ his answers to the objections of Quryāqus in Muḥarram 355 A.H., since these objections, according to the introduction to the treatise,²⁰ were made later in the month of Sha'bān the same year. Due to this fact, Platti²¹ has suggested that this note should be regarded as a part of the colophon of the preceding treatise (no. 29),²² which is the letter to al-Qāsim.²³ For some strange reason, Endress²⁴ mentions this note about the manuscript tradition in connection with treatise no. 32 - the controversy with al-Miṣrī.²⁵

In any case, we may take it for granted that the note only refers to a certain part of the manuscript, and not to the entire collection of 33 treatises, which leaves us without any further information about the manuscript tradition of *Risāla fī tathbīt* prior to MS A. The suggestion that the present collection is of a secondary nature, and not an original compilation is corroborated by a marginal note in MS A²⁶ at the end of the tiny treatise no. 16: "In one manuscript this is found after the treatise which attacks the Nestorians (هذه في النسخة بعد الرسالة الكرة على النساطرة)."

In MS B,²⁷ this marginal note has been inserted in the text between treatise no. 16 and treatise no. 17, and in addition to this, the word *الكرة* has been changed into *الكبيرة*.²⁸ As Platti²⁹ has pointed out, the tiny treatise no. 16 is found after the anti-Nestorian treatises in MS Vat. ar. 115.

18 Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 136 (note).

19 In fact Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 136 (note), says that Yahyā "dictated", taking Yahyā to be the subject of the verb *قرأ* in the note. Since it is clearly stated, in the note, that al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār copied the autograph of his master, I find it more consistent with the context to regard al-Ḥasan ibn Suwār as the subject of *قرأ*.

20 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Munāqaḍa li-Quryāqus*, 5* (§ 1).

21 Platti, *Yahyā ibn 'Adī*, 136 (note).

22 Treatise no. 30 has been disregarded since it only contains Bishr ibn Faḍl as-Sayrafi's question without any answer by Yahyā.

23 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Risāla ilā Abī l-Ḥasan al-Qāsim*.

24 Endress, *Works*, 113. His reference to fol. 265r of MS B is also erroneous.

25 Yahyā ibn 'Adī, *Maqāla fī tabyīn ḍalālat an-naṣṭūriyya*.

26 MS A, fol. 70r.

27 MS B, fol. 105v.

28 Cf. p. 112 below.

29 Platti, *La grande polémique* 1, VII.